# DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 221 990 EC 150 058

| | |
|---|---|
| AUTHOR | Havlicek, Larry L.; Kelly, Phyllis |
| TITLE | Three Year Evaluation Summary for A Statewide Network for Special Education Paraprofessional Training. |
| INSTITUTION | Kansas State Dept. of Education, Topeka. |
| SPONS AGENCY | Department of Education, Washington, DC. |
| PUB DATE | 8 Jul 81 |
| GRANT | G007801422 |
| NOTE | 245p.; Print is poor in parts. |
| EDRS PRICE | MF01/PC10 Plus Postage. |
| DESCRIPTORS | Delivery Systems; *Disabilities; Information Dissemination; *Inservice Education; *Institutes (Training Programs); *Paraprofessional School Personnel; Postsecondary Education; Program Development; *Program Evaluation; *State Programs |
| IDENTIFIERS | Education for All Handicapped Children Act; *Kansas Network Special Education Paraprofessional; Rehabilitation Act 1973 (Section 504) |

ABSTRACT

The document contains the 3-year evaluation summary for the Kansas Statewide Network for Special Education Paraprofessional Training. The program's purpose is fourfold: (1) to develop an increasing awareness of the professionalism of the paraprofessional in the total educational system; (2) to present an overview of P.L. 94-142 (the Education for All Handicapped Children Act) and the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, Section 504 regulations; (3) to discuss legal implications of the role of the special education paraprofessional; and (4) to provide an opportunity for special education paraprofessionals to attend miniworkshop sessions on a variety of special education topics. Findings for each of the three evaluation reports are presented in terms of project objectives. Among third year results are that workshops were well received; were effective in training paraprofessionals, teachers, and facilitators; and were viewed in a very positive way. Attachments to the third year report include a sample registration form, a conference agenda, and a table of paraprofessional training materials. The second year report also cites the success of the program, based on the process and performance objectives. A first year report makes up more than half the document and contains separate sections on process objectives (such as the development of a training package for facilitators based on paraprofessional training needs); performance objectives (such as demonstration by trained paraprofessionals of understanding the characteristics of the special education student); and formative evaluations of seven workshops. Appendixes to the third year report include agendas from regional workshops, a list of facilitators, paraprofessional newsletters, a sample copy of the Paraprofessional Rating Scale, and sample interview forms. (SW)

***********************************************************************
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
***********************************************************************

ED221990

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

0199

SCOPE OF INTEREST NOTICE
The ERIC Facility has assigned this document for processing to: EC | TM

In our judgement, this document is also of interest to the clearinghouses noted to the right. Indexing should reflect their special points of view.

# THREE YEAR EVALUATION SUMMARY FOR
# A STATEWIDE NETWORK FOR SPECIAL EDUCATION
# PARAPROFESSIONAL TRAINING

ED Grant No. G007801422

Kansas State Department of Education

Topeka, Kansas 66612

July 8, 1981

By

Larry L. Havlicek

2570 Cedarwood Avenue

Lawrence, Kansas 66044

Phyllis Kelly Project Director
Kansas Facilitator Paraprofessional Training Program

EC 150058

SEQQ/5

# THREE YEAR SUMMARY

During the past three years of Federal funding, the Kansas Statewide Network for Special Education Paraprofessional Training program has made an impressive impact on special education in the State of Kansas, as well as making an impressive national impact. The purpose of this three-year summary is to summarize the effectiveness and productivity of this program.

During the past three years, there was a total of 1,874 paraprofessional workshops conducted by all of the districts/cooperatives in the State of Kansas. During the 1978-79 year, there were 512 paraprofessional workshops conducted, 717 during the 1979-80 year, and 645 during the 1980-81 school year. This compares to only 101 paraprofessional workshops conducted during the 1976-77 school year and 204 conducted during the 1977-78 school year. Thus, the number of paraprofessional workshops conducted during the past year was over six times the number conducted two years before the program began.

Equally impressive is the fact that during the three years of the program, all of the districts/cooperatives in the State of Kansas were involved in conducting paraprofessional workshops as compared to only 80 percent of the districts/cooperatives being involved before the program began.

The number of inservice hours provided for paraprofessional training has also increased during the past three years. During the 1978-79 school year, a total of 1,773 hours of inservice training was provided for paraprofessionals, 2,892 hours provided during the 1979-80 school year, and 2,965 during the 1980-81 school year. The total number of hours of inservice training provided for paraprofessionals during the three years of the program was 7,630 hours. As indicated by the number of hours per year, there was an increase in the number of hours for each year of the program.

The number of paraprofessional permits awarded also increased, starting in 1979 when these permits were first given. During the second year of the program, there were 1,201 Level I permits awarded, 181 Level II permits, and 222 Level III permits awarded. During the third year of the program, there were 1,906 Level I permits awarded, 354 Level II permits, and 406 Level III permits awarded. Thus, the number of permits awarded increased from the second to the third years of the program.

During the past three years, a total of 65 articles were received from personnel in the participating districts/cooperatives for publication in the Paraprofessional Newsletters.

In addition to the above, an impressive set of training materials and media were developed for training paraprofessionals during the three years of the program. A listing of these materials and media is presented in Appendix A of this report.

During the three years of the program, each paraprofessional, facilitator, and other personnel workshops were evaluated by the external evaluator for the program. These evaluations served mainly as a formative evaluation, providing data about the workshops so that changes could be made based upon the recommendations of those attending the workshops. There was a definite trend towards higher ratings from the first year of the program through the third year. This indicates that the program staff were able to use this data to effectively improve the workshops so that there were higher ratings of effectiveness and utilizations of the information presented in these workshops. Written-in comments about the later workshops, such as, "best yet," "great improvement from last year," etc., attest to the improved quality of the workshops in the second and third year of the program. Thus, these workshops evaluations also serve as a summative evaluation, showing that there was improvement in the quality of the workshops over the three years of the program.

The external evaluator also compiled year-end reports for each of the three years of the program. In these reports, it was noted that during the first year of the program, only 10 of the 12 process objectives were completely met and only one of the three performance objectives. During the second year of the program, all of the 14 process objectives were met as well as all of the three performance objectives. Likewise, during the third year of the program, all of the 21 process objectives were met as were the four performance objectives. Thus, there is evidence that the program became more efficient and productive during the three years of funding.

Thus, during the three years of the program, there has been a great impact on special education in the State of Kansas. There also has been an impressive national impact. National presentations and lists of materials and media sent to educators in other states are available on file in the Special Education Office. Thus, it can be concluded that during the three years of the program, there has been a tremendous impact on special education not only in the State of Kansas, but also nationally.

# THIRD YEAR EVALUATION REPORT FOR
# A STATEWIDE NETWORK FOR SPECIAL EDUCATION
# PARAPROFESSIONAL TRAINING

Kansas State Department of Education
Topeka, Kansas 66612

July 8, 1981

by

Larry L. Havlicek
2570 Cedarwood Avenue
Lawrence, Kansas 66044

# INTRODUCTION

The evaluation report for the third year of the Kansas Statewide Network for Special Education Paraprofessional Training will follow the same format as the previous two year-end reports. As delineated in the original proposal, a two-level evaluation procedure was used to evaluate this paraprofessional training program. The first level evaluation involved the internal staff who maintained the documentation for all of the process objectives. The second level was done by the contracted evaluator who did the evaluation for all of the workshops and for all of the performance objectives. Since both formative and summative evaluation procedures were used during the third year, this report will summarize the evaluation reports presented during the year by the external evaluator.

This third-year evaluation report will follow the same order as the objectives were stated in the Program Evaluation Plan for the third year. Thus, the process objectives will be reported first, followed by the performance objectives.

## PROCESS OBJECTIVES

The first process objective for the third year of the program was:

> 1.A During the third year of the program, the training and communication network will be strengthened through use of evaluation information. Any changes will be the responsibility of the Kansas State Department of Education program staff and will be documented by written reports of such changes.

This objective has been met as documented by the following process objectives. The training and communication network has been expanded as described in specific objectives, and appropriate documentation for each improvement is on file in the Special Education Office within the Kansas State Department of Education.

The second process objective was:

> 1.B During the third year, facilitator workshops and other communication activities will be continued to provide local districts with competencies to work with higher education personnel to meet future training needs. Program staff will be responsible for this objective and all workshops and communication activities will be documented as to agendas and rosters of participants.

This objective was met as one one-day and two two-day workshops were provided for new facilitators, and two two-day workshops were provided for all facilitators. A total of 24 new facilitators attended the new facilitator workshop, and a total of 21 facilitators out of 67 facilitators attended both workshops for all facilitators. In addition to these workshops, there was continual communication with the facilitators through use of the "hot line" which was available to the facilitators as needed. Also, the newsletters and other announcements served as communication of activities with the facilitators. All of these activities are well documented including agendas and rosters of participants for all workshops.

The third process objective was:

> 1.C During the third year, six workshops will be held for teachers using college personnel, facilitators, and college special educators as principal resource people. Documentation will be agendas for each workshop and lists of participants.

More than six sessions were offered at the Statewide Paraprofessional Workshop held in Topeka for teachers. Thus, this objective was met. Agendas for these sessions are complete, but lists of participants could not be obtained due to the large number of people in attendance at the Statewide meeting.

Objective number four was:

> 1.D During the third year, program staff will continue to support the Paraprofessional Newsletter as evidenced by the Newsletters sent out to schools in the State.

Three newsletters were published and sent out to schools in the State. The first was published in November, 1980, the second in February, 1981, and the third in May, 1981. Thus, this objective was met.

The fifth process objective was:

> 1.E During the third year, program staff will continue to make on-site visits and evaluations of projects and situations as evidenced by records of visits and collected data.

A total of 27 on-site visits were made during the year. During these on-site visits, interviews were held with 81 paraprofessionals, 54 supervising teachers, and 14 facilitators. Each visit is documented and is listed as Attachment A to this report. Thus, this objective was met and is well documented.

The sixth objective was:

> 1.F During the third year of the program, a Statewide Paraprofessional Conference will be held as evidenced by the agenda for the meeting, post-conference reaction forms, and lists of participants. Program staff will be responsible for conducting this conference.

This objective was met. Attachment B gives the program for this conference and lists the agenda. Post conference reaction forms were completed by the participants and a report was made of their responses. Since 436 people were in attendance, names will not be listed in this report. However, registration files listing the names of the participants are available. Thus, this objective was met and is well documented.

The seventh process objective was:

> 1.G During the third year, six one-day regional meetings will be held with local educators about the program. Program staff will be responsible for conducting these meetings, and agendas and lists of participants will serve as documentation.

There were eight one-day regional workshops held during the year as listed in Attachment C. In addition, other presentations to educators were made. The agendas and lists of participants at these meetings are on file in the Special Education Office. Thus, this objective was completely met.

The eighth objective was:

> 2.A During the third year, program staff will continue to interact with college special educators on preservice training of special education teachers as evidenced by records of these meetings and details of the discussions.

Paraprofessional programs or course work was developed in six community colleges and is pending in others. Also, there was contact with ten other colleges in the state about such programs during the year. Technical assistance was also given to those colleges with new programs or proposed programs. There was also a Community College Program Workshop for Deans of Instruction given on November 24, 1980, as well as a Class Presentation on Roles and Responsibilities of Paraprofessionals at Butler County Community College on September 4, 1980. Thus, this objective was met and is well documented.

The ninth objective was:

> During the third year, program staff will continue to work on the development of community college curricula and Associate of Arts programs, as evidenced by revised curricula and correspondence related to the Associate of Arts programs.

As indicated in the previous objective, paraprofessional programs and coursework was developed in six community colleges during the year. Such work is pending in ten other colleges. Thus, this objective was met and is well documented by the coursework that was developed by each college.

The tenth objective was:

> 3.A During the third year of the program, one one-day conference of all individuals involved in the program will be held to establish guidelines for program continuance as documented by conference agendas and lists of participants. Program staff will be responsible for these conferences.

10

This one-day conference was held at the same time as the Statewide Conference. Thus, this objective was met and is well documented by the agenda of the conference and a list of those in attendance.

The eleventh objective was:

> 3.B During the third year, project staff will meet with national and state leaders, participants, and advocates of paraprofessional training to plan for continued and future activities related to special education paraprofessionals. Documentation for this objective will be the lists of such meetings including names of participants and agendas for each meeting as well as developed recommendations.

This objective was met as documented by the lists of meetings and contacts presented in Attachment D. Documentation of all recommendations is in the Central Data File for the project.

The twelfth objective was:

> 4.A During the third year of the project, all media and materials, as detailed in Appendix M of the Continuation Grant, will be completed. Project staff will be responsible for this objective, and documentation will be the completed media and materials.

All media and materials were completed, thus, this objective was met. One slide tape was produced during the third year, three video cassettes were produced, and new guidelines were completed during the past year. The Resource Bank was indexed for efficient and immediate reference. All media and materials serve as documentation for the completion of this objective.

The thirteenth objective was:

> 4.B During the third year, project staff will review and revise all media and materials developed in previous project years. Documentation will be the revisions that have been made.

This objective was met. Complete documentation exists in the form of revised media and materials that is available from the project office.

The fourteenth objective was:

> 4.C During the third year, project staff will complete the resource bank for paraprofessionals in special education. Documentation will be the completd card file and index system that is to be developed.

This objective was met and is appropriately documented. The Resource Bank has been indexed and is ready for use.

The fifteenth objective was:

> 5.A During the third year, a publication covering all principal components of the project will be developed and will be completed by the end of the third year. Project staff will be responsible, and the completed publication will be the documentation.

A publication in the form of a file covering all principal aspects of the project and all components is available in the project office. Thus, this objective has been met and is well documented.

The sixteenth objective was:

> 5.B During the third year, project staff administrators will develop a national presentation on implementing a statewide paraprofessional training network and make it available to any state considering such a program. Documentation will be the completed presentation.

This objective was met and is well documented by the presentation on file in the project office. During the third year of the project, 10 national presentations were made as listed in Attachment E.

The seventeenth objective was:

> 5.C During the year, dissemination activity by the project staff and KEDDS will be expanded as documented by all dissemination activities completed during the year.

During the past year, the following dissemination activities took place and are completely documented. A program brochure was sent to 1,216 in-state educators and to 209 out-of-state educators. Paraprofessional Guidelines were sent to 600 educators in-state, and to 165 educators out-of-state. The Paraprofessional Facilitator Manual was sent to 6 educators in-state, and to 128 educators out-of-state. There were a total of 156 in-state slide-tape requests that were filled, and 89 out-of-state requests filled. Thus, this objective was met and is well documented.

The eighteenth objective was:

> 6.A Written evaluation will be obtained from the participants of all workshops held during the third year and the results will be compiled and used in a formative way.

All workshops were evaluated by the external evaluator and an evaluation report was written for each workshop. Results of the evaluations were used to improve and revise workshops, and these revisions were effective as the ratings progressively became more positive. Thus, this objective has been met and is well documented.

The nineteenth objective was:

> 6.B During the third year, meetings of the following committees will be held: Paraprofessional Guidelines Committee, Paraprofessional Planning Committee, and the Paraprofessional Advisory Committee. Documentation for this objective will include the agendas for the meetings, lists of personnel attending, minutes of each meeting, and possible post-meeting reaction forms.

Attachment D lists the dates of these meetings. The Planning Committee and the Advisory Council met during the year, but there were no meetings of the Paraprofessional Guidelines Committee since committee work on the Guidelines had been completed. Thus, this objective was met and is well documented by agendas of the meetings, lists of those attending, minutes, and results of the meetings in terms of recommendations.

Objective twenty was:

> 6.C During the third year, at least three full-time paraprofessionals will serve as facilitators as documented by lists of these paraprofessionals and how they served as facilitators.

A total of 11 paraprofessionals served as facilitators during the year. Thus, this objective was met and is well documented.

The last process objective for the third year was:

> 7.A All workshops, conferences, and meetings will be held in facilities which are accessible to the handicapped as per 504 regulations and stipulations. Documentation will be descriptions and/or reports of the facilities.

This objective was met as all activities were conducted in facilities accessible to the handicapped as per 504 regulations.

There were 21 process objectives to be completed during the third year of the project. All of these objectives were met and are well documented. Thus, the project was very successful in meeting all of its process objectives. The project staff are to be commended for their excellent record keeping system, which not only documents all activities, but will serve as a guide for other states desiring to set up a statewide paraprofessional training program.

## PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES

There were four major performance objectives to be met during the third year. For each objective, a number of rating scales were used to measure the performance level delineated in the objective. The results of the evaluation for each objective will be presented in tables with interpretation for each of the four objectives. The first performance objective was:

> 1. During the third year of the program, a random sample of 50 paraprofessionals, who have been trained in the program, will demonstrate competency in skills for paraprofessionals by being rated on the average higher than 2.5 on a 5-point scale of performance developed from the list of skills for paraprofessionals. The rating form used during the second year of the program will be used to assess skills. This form uses a Likert rating scale.

In order to determine whether or not this objective was met, a 15-item "Paraprofessional Rating Scale" was developed. This scale was used by 50 supervisors who rated the paraprofessionals selected on a random basis. The rating scale used a 4-point scale rather than a 5-point scale because it was felt that the supervisors could use this scale more easily than a 5-point scale. The 4-point scale was set up so that a "1" rating indicated 'excellent' performance, "2" indicated 'good' performance, "3" 'fair' performance, and "4" 'poor' performance. The distribution of the ratings and the mean ratings are presented in Table I. As can be noted from Table 1, all of the mean ratings were between 'good' and 'excellent,' and were above the mid-point in the rating scale. Thus, this objective was met for all of the 15 skills which were being rated. It should be noted that the paraprofessionals were rated highest in their skill in working with students in one-to-one situations followed by interpersonal relations skills - communicating with supervising teachers. They were rating lowest in their skill of working with students in large group activities. Additional information provided in this evaluation indicated that the average years of experience in the classroom that the rated paraprofessionals had was 3 years with a standard deviation of 2.19 years. The level of training for the paraprofessionals rated was as follows: 23 paraprofessionals had 30 clock hours or less of training, 6 had one year of college, and 18 had two years of college or more.

The second performance objective was:

> 2. During the third year of the program, a random sample of 50 paraprofessionals who have been trained in the program will demonstrate a postive attitude toward the paraprofessional education program as measured by a Likert 5-point rating scale. Positive attitude will be defined as a mean response higher than 2.5 on the 5-point Likert scale.

## TABLE 1

## PARAPROFESSIONAL RATING SCALE

| Item | Ex.<br>1 | Good<br>2 | Fair<br>3 | Poor<br>4 | Mean |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Effective in working with students in: | | | | | |
| one-to-one situations | 42 | 8 | | | 1.16 |
| small group activities | 30 | 20 | | | 1.40 |
| large group activities | 13 | 30 | 1 | | 1.73 |
| Interpersonal relations: | | | | | |
| with supervising teacher | 37 | 10 | 3 | | 1.32 |
| with program staff | 34 | 13 | 2 | | 1.35 |
| with regular staff | 28 | 17 | 3 | | 1.48 |
| Using equipment/materials | 16 | 17 | | | 1.52 |
| Using educ. techniques | 21 | 26 | 3 | | 1.64 |
| Managing students through: | | | | | |
| use of classroom skills | 24 | 25 | | | 1.51 |
| use of reinforcement skills | 27 | 21 | 1 | | 1.47 |
| Demonstrating understanding: of exceptional students | 31 | 19 | | | 1.38 |
| Preparation skills: | | | | | |
| classroom materials | 31 | 19 | | | 1.38 |
| class environments | 29 | 19 | 1 | | 1.43 |
| Skill in operating: | | | | | |
| office equipment | 31 | 11 | 5 | | 1.45 |
| audio-visual equipment | 25 | 14 | 4 | | 1.51 |

A 13-item attitude scale was developed and used to measure the second performance objective. Each of the 13 items used a 5-point rating scale for which "1" represented very dissatisfied, "2" dissatisfied, "3" a neutral attitude, "4" satisfied, and "5" very satisfied. The results of the tabulation of the responses are presented in Table 2 above. As can be noted from the mean responses listed in the last column, all of the mean ratings were above 2.5,

## TABLE 2

## PARAPROFESSIONAL ATTITUDES

| Item | RATINGS 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Amount of training received from your district as a para. | 6 | 18 | 43 | 75 | 53 | 3.77 |
| Amount of training received from the Para Training Program in: | | | | | | |
| Skills related to working with children | 5 | 22 | 50 | 119 | 43 | 3.72 |
| Subject matter skills | 8 | 23 | 64 | 110 | 30 | 3.56 |
| Understanding characteristics of special education students | 5 | 20 | 55 | 109 | 50 | 3.75 |
| Behavior management skills | 4 | 17 | 68 | 101 | 45 | 3.71 |
| Classroom interpersonal relations | 7 | 18 | 59 | 109 | 43 | 3.69 |
| Interpersonal relations skills in working with supervisors | 12 | 20 | 51 | 93 | 63 | 3.73 |
| Organizational skills | 15 | 12 | 68 | 102 | 36 | 3.57 |
| Operating office and A/V equip. | 21 | 38 | 80 | 60 | 34 | 3.21 |
| Working with special handicaps | 12 | 31 | 75 | 79 | 35 | 3.41 |
| Overall satisfaction with the Para Training Program. | 6 | 14 | 47 | 107 | 64 | 3.88 |
| Overall satisfaction with the goals and objectives of program. | 4 | 8 | 36 | 110 | 77 | 4.06 |
| Overall satisfaction in working as a paraprofessional. | 2 | 4 | 13 | 56 | 164 | 4.57 |

indicating a very high positive attitude. Thus, the second performance objective was met. It should be noted that attitude ratings were obtained from 241 paraprofessionals, more than the 50 called for in the objective.

The third performance objective was:

> 3. During the third year of the program, a random sample of 50 paraprofessionals will rate the materials and media that they have been using as being appropriate for their training. A 5-point Likert rating scale will be used for this assessment and a mean rating higher than 2.5 will be used as the criterion.

A six-item rating scale was used by 50 paraprofessionals to rate the materials and media that they used in their training. Their responses are tabulated in Table 3. The first item dealt with how interesting the paraprofessionals thought that the program was. The mean response was 1.87, which is between the "very interesting" and "interesting" points in the scale, and above the half-way point. Thus, the objective was met for this aspect of the objective. The second item dealing with the extent to which the program provided them with a better understanding and workable ideas. This was also rated above the mid-point, with a mean rating of 1.70. The fifth item asked if the paraprofessionals would recommend this program for use in training others, and all of the respondents indicated that they would. The last item asked the paras to rate the program as a training/orientation for paraprofessionals, and the average grade given was half-way between an A and a B. Thus, this objective was met.

The last performance objective was:

> 4. During the third year of the program, a random sample of 50 teachers and/or supervisors will rate the materials and media developed for training paraprofessionals as appropriate. A 5-point Likert rating scale will be used and a mean rating higher than 2.5 will be used as the criterion.

## TABLE 3

## PARAPROFESSIONALS' EVALUATION OF TRAINING MATERIALS AND MEDIA

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| How interesting did you find the program to be? | Very interesting | 9 | Mean = 1.87 |
| | Interesting | 35 | |
| | So-So | 3 | |
| | Uninteresting | | |
| | Dull | | |
| To what extent did the program provide you with a better understanding and workable ideas? | A great deal | 17 | Mean = 1.70 |
| | Provided some | 27 | |
| | Provided little | 3 | |
| | Provided Nothing | | |
| | ? | | |
| How difficult was the material presented? | Very difficult | | Mean = 3.91 |
| | Rather difficult | 3 | |
| | So-So | 11 | |
| | Rather easy | 24 | |
| | Very easy | 10 | |
| How many times do you feel that the program needs to be viewed in order to sufficiently master the concepts? | Once | 25 | Mean = 1.62 |
| | Two times | 19 | |
| | 3 or 4 | 1 | |
| | 4 or more | | |
| | ? | 2 | |
| Would you recommend this program for use in the training/orientation of other paraprofessionals? | Yes | 42 | |
| | No | | |
| | ? | | |
| How would you grade this program as a training/orientation for paraprofessionals? | A | 28 | Mean = 1.49 |
| | B | 15 | |
| | C | 4 | |
| | D | | |
| | F | | |
| | ? | | |

An eight-item rating scale was used to evaluate the fourth objective. The responses of the 50 teachers/supervisors are presented in Table 4. As can be noted from Table 4, the objective was met for all of the items. The only suggestions that the responses imply is that the materials and media might be

## TABLE 4

## TEACHERS/SUPERVISORS EVALUATION OF TRAINING MATERIALS AND MEDIA

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Was the program of significant assistance in orienting and training paraprofessionals? | Very much so | 37 | Mean = 1.57 |
| | Yes | 31 | |
| | Somewhat | 2 | |
| | No | | |
| How was the program received by paraprofessionals? | Very well | 31 | Mean = 1.58 |
| | Well received | 36 | |
| | Mixed | 2 | |
| | Not well received | | |
| If viewed by teachers, administrators, or support personnel, how was the program received? | Very well | 16 | Mean = 1.35 |
| | Well received | 6 | |
| | Mixed | 1 | |
| | Not well received | | |
| Length of program: | Much too long | 1 | Mean = 2.97 |
| | Too long | 2 | |
| | About right | 69 | |
| | Too brief | 2 | |
| | Much too brief | | |
| Overall relevance: | Very relevant | 32 | Mean = 1.58 |
| | Relevant | 40 | |
| | So-So | 1 | |
| | Not relevant | | |
| Accuracy of content: | Very accurate | 32 | Mean = 1.58 |
| | Accurate | 30 | |
| | So-So | 4 | |
| | Incomplete | | |
| Clarity of concepts: | Very clear | 33 | Mean = 1.55 |
| | Clear | 37 | |
| | Mixed | 1 | |
| | Unclear | | |
| Completeness: | Very complete | 30 | Mean = 1.67 |
| | Complete | 32 | |
| | So-So | 4 | |
| | Incomplete | 1 | |

too long. It should be noted that a total of 74 teachers and/or supervisors rated the materials and media, which is above the 50 called for in the objective. The average number of paraprofessionals trained by these teachers and/or supervisors was 14.34, with a standard deviation of 15.08. The rating forms were completed by 44 facilitators, 17 teachers, 4 administrators, 1 support person, and 7 others who did not check one of the above categories. On the basis of the ratings of these 74 educators, it is clear that the fourth performance objective was met.

In summary, all four of the performance objectives were clearly met. The ratings exceeded the criterion set for each objective. Thus, the program was successful in meeting its performance objectives for the third year.

## SUMMARY

During the third year of the Statewide Network for Special Education Paraprofessional Training program, there were 21 process objectives and four performance objectives to be met. As indicated in this report, all of these objectives were met. Thus, the program was very effective in attaining all of the objectives set for the program during the year.

In addition to the end-of-year evaluation, each workshop was evaluated using a rating scale. The results of these evaluations indicated that the workshops were well received, were effective in training paraprofessionals, teachers, and facilitators, and were viewed in a very positive way. Thus, it can be concluded that the program has been very effective in training paraprofessionals to work in the area of special education.

ATTACHMENT A

## PARAPROFESSIONAL PROGRAM VISITS

| Date | Location of Visit | Coordinators |
|---|---|---|
| 7/25/80 | Wichita (met with Jim Dyk & Fran Blake) | Jan |
| 9/5/80 | Topeka (met with Win Green) | Jan & PK |
| 9/24/80 | Topeka (worked with Onan Burnett) | Jan |
| 10/20/80 | Lawrence | Jan & PK |
| 10/29/80 | El Dorado (contact visit) | Jan |
| 11/17/80 | Great Bend (site visit) | Jan & PK |
| 11/21/80 | Beloit | PK & Carolyn |
| 12/17/80 | Topeka (worked with new facilitator) | Jan |
| 12/16/80 | Colby | PK & Carolyn |
| 12/17/80 | Phillipsburg | PK & Carolyn |
| 1/22/81 | Valley Center | PK & Carolyn |
| 1/27&28/81 | Coldwater | Jan & Carolyn |
| 2/18/81 | KSSD | PK & Carolyn |
| 2/18/81 | KSSVH | Carolyn |
| 3/3/81 | Garden City | PK |
| 3/2/81 | Dodge City | PK |
| 4/2/81 | Newton | PK |
| 4/3/81 | Hutchinson District #308 | Rhonda |
| 4/3/81 | Pratt | Jan |
| 4/27/81 | Reno County Special Education Coop. | Jan |
| 5/12/81 | Wamego | Jane |
| 5/12/81 | St. Marys | Jane |
| 5/13/81 | Baldwin | Jane |
| 5/13/81 | Leavenworth | Jan & PK |
| 5/14/81 | Junction City | Jane |

ATTACHMENT B

# ANNUAL 3rd STATEWIDE PARAPROFESSIONAL CONFERENCE

PARAPROFESSIONALS
STUDENTS
ADMINISTRATORS
PARENTS
TEACHERS

A
DIVERSITY OF TALENT
A
UNITY OF PURPOSE

**March 26-27, 1981**
**Thursday, 7:00 - 9:30 P.M.**
**(Registration: 5:00 - 7:00 P.M.)**
**Friday, 8:00 A.M. - 5:00 P.M.**

**Ramada Inn Downtown**
**420 East 6TH**
**East Sixth on Interstate 70**
**Topeka, Kansas**
**233-8981**
**Toll Free Number:**
**1-800-432-2424**
**(Hotel Reservation must be made by March 1, 1981.)**

- **Teachers and Other Guests Welcome.**
- **One hour of college credit is being negotiated for this workshop. Complete details will be available at registration.**

**THE KANSAS STATE DEPT. OF EDUCATION**
**Special Education Administration**
**Jan Beck and Phyllis Kelly,**
**Coordinators**

## CONFERENCE PRESENTERS

### "The Special Education Paraprofessional - Vital Link in the Educational Process"

Dr. Greg Frith
Jacksonville State University
Jacksonville, Florida

### "Special Education Paraprofessionals in the United States Today"

Andy Humm
New Careers Training Laboratory
New York, New York

### "Stress Management for Special Education Paraprofessionals"

Dr. Wayne Osness
Department of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation
University of Kansas

## SESSIONS ON:

The Menninger Foundation Children's Division (Southard School serves the severely emotionally handicapped through LD and PSA instruction)

Assertiveness and the Gifted Student

Seminar in Awareness (of the Visually Impaired and Hearing Impaired)

Art and Materials Development

Behavior Management Skills

Film Studio (continuous run of video, 16mm, and slide/sound programs)

New Games

Street Drugs (for those who work with older students)

Seminar for Paraprofessionals in Preschool Programs

Seminar for Paraprofessionals in Severely Multiply Handicapped Programs

Capper Foundation for Crippled Children

Topeka Association for Retarded Citizens (classrooms and sheltered workshop setting

## SPECIAL NOTE

Chris Curry will again provide entertainment for Friday's luncheon through musical expression of the students with whom she works.

# REGISTRATION FORM

## STATEWIDE PARAPROFESSIONAL WORKSHOP

March 26 & 27, 1981

NAME: ______________________________

ADDRESS: ______________________________
(Street) (City) (Zip Code)

District or Cooperative Representing: ______________________________

______________________________

Categorical Area(s) (LD, Speech . . . .) You Are Assigned To:

______________________________

REGISTRATION FEE IS $12.00 (registration for persons attending only the Thursday evening session is $6.00) and must be paid prior to workshop. NO CASH PLEASE!

Please make your checks payable to: THE ATCHISON-JEFFERSON EDUCATION COOP.
(We will not be able to refund registration fee.)

Preregistration form and check should be returned no later than Tuesday, March 17, 1981. Registration fee includes refreshments and lunch on Friday, conference room rental, and conference materials.

Please return entire form and your registration fee to:

Jan Beck
Special Education Administration
Kansas State Dept. of Education
120 E. 10th
Topeka, KS 66612
(913) 296-3867

## FIELD TRIPS!

Please indicate if you wish to make a field trip to one of the following facilities in place of one small group session Friday afternoon. You must arrange your own transportation to the field trip site. This opportunity must be limited to the first 50 requests received during preregistration.

☐ 1. Capper Foundation for Crippled Children

☐ 2. Topeka Association for Retarded Citizens (Classrooms and sheltered workshop setting)

## MATERIALS DISPLAY

Volunteers are needed to provide teacher or para-made items for a materials display. Please describe briefly any item you wish to display. We recommend that duplicate materials be displayed to avoid damage or loss of original materials.

Please reserve space for my display. I will bring the following item: ______________________________

______________________________

We urge you to participate.

If you desire a special lunch for Lent, please check here: ☐

Please indicate if you need any specialized assistance:
Interpreters: ____________
Brailling: ____________
Other: ____________

ATTACHMENT B

## THIRD ANNUAL STATEWIDE PARAPROFESSIONAL CONFERENCE

Ramada Inn Downtown
Topeka, Kansas

March 26 & 27, 1981

## AGENDA

**THURSDAY, MARCH 26, 1981**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 5:00 - 7:00 | Registration | Main Lobby Alcove |
| 7:00 - 7:30 | Welcome | Mr. L. C. Crouch |
| | Opening Remarks | Jan Beck<br>Phyllis Kelly |
| 7:30 - 9:00 | "Stress Management for Special Education Paraprofessionals and Teachers" | Dr. Wayne Osness |
| 9:00 - 11:00 | RECEPTION | Host: Al Marten<br>Ramada Exhibit Arena |

**FRIDAY, MARCH 27, 1981**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 8:00 - 9:00 | Registration | Main Lobby Alcove |
| 9:00 - 9:30 | Welcome | Dr. Merle R. Bolton |
| | Opening Remarks | Jan Beck<br>Phyllis Kelly<br>Diana Schuster |
| 9:30 - 10:30 | "The Special Education Paraprofessional - Vital Link in the Educational Process" | Dr. Greg Frith |
| 10:45 - 11:45 | **Select one of the following small group sessions:** | |
| | ● Seminar for Paraprofessionals Working With Students on Vocational Education Skills | Foyer 4 East<br>Connee Alexander |
| | ● Materials Display | Parlor A<br>Ann Fritz |
| | ● "Special Education Paraprofessionals in the United States Today" (See Session Descriptors) | Foyer 3 West<br>Andy Humm |
| | ● "Assertiveness and the Gifted Student" | Foyer 2 West<br>Woody Houseman |
| | ● "Let the Room, the Materials, and How You Present Them Help You Teach Young Children and Infants" | Foyer 3 East<br>Alita Cooper |
| | ● Menninger Foundation Programs | Foyer 1 East<br>Randy Schmidt |
| | ● Media Viewing Studio (See Session Descriptors) | Parlor B East & West<br>Dr. Gerry Hahn |
| | ● Seminar for Paraprofessionals Working With LD Students (See Session Descriptors) | Grand Ballroom<br>Dr. Floyd Hudson |
| | ● Vocational Training in the SMH Classroom | Parlor C<br>Eileen Luddy |
| | ● Tell Your Problems to a Dummy: A Unique Approach to Classroom Behavior Problems | Foyer 2 East<br>Jan Cooley |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 12:00 - 2:00 | LUNCHEON | Regency West |
| | - Speaker | Representative Sandy Duncan |
| | - Musical Entertainment | Chris Curry & Company |
| | - Awards Presentation | James Marshall |
| 2:30 - 3:45 | **Select one of the following small group sessions:** | |
| | - Media Viewing Studio | Parlor B East & West<br>Dr. Gerry Hahn |
| | - "Special Education Paraprofessionals in the United States Today" (See Session Descriptors) | Foyer 3 West<br>Andy Humm |
| | - "Self Motivation or a Push From Without: The Power of Positive Thinking" (See Session Descriptors) | Grand Ballroom<br>Dr. Greg Frith |
| | - Tell Your Problems to a Dummy: A Unique Approach to Classroom Behavior Problems | Foyer 2 East<br>Jan Cooley |
| | - Menninger Foundation Programs | Foyer 1 East<br>Randy Schmidt |
| | - Seminar for Paraprofessionals Working With Students on Vocational Education Skills | Foyer 4 East<br>Connee Alexander |
| | - Orientation to Drugs of Abuse: A Shotgun Approach (See Session Descriptors) | Foyer 2 West<br>George Sahker |
| | - Seminar in Awareness of the Hearing and Visually Impaired | Foyer 3 East<br>Esther Taylor<br>Jodi Winslow |
| | - New Games<br>(See Session Descriptors) | Foyer 1 West<br>Sharon Goodwin<br>Alan Apel<br>Sara Smith |
| | - Materials Display | Parlor A<br>Ann Fritz |
| 4:00 - 4:30 | Closing Remarks | Senator Nancy Parrish |
| 4:30 - 4:45 | Conference Conclusion and Evaluation | Jan Beck<br>Fran Blake |

ATTACHMENT C

## PARAPROFESSIONAL SPONSORED WORKSHOPS

| Date | Name of Workshop | No. in Attendance | Location | Coord.'s |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 9/26/80 | New Facilitator Workshop | 24 | Topeka | PK Jan |
| 10/18/80 | Kansas City Regional | 68 | Kansas City | PK Jan |
| 10/30/80 | Wichita Area Regional | 157 | El Dorado | Jan |
| 11/6&7/80 | First Facilitator Workshop | 62 | Wichita | PK Jan |
| 11/18/80 | Dodge City Regional | 96 | Dodge City | Jan |
| 11/19/80 | Great Bend Regional | 68 | Great Bend | PK Jan |
| 11/24/80 | Community College Program Workshop | 7 | Topeka | PK Jan |
| 12/2/80 | Topeka Area Regional | 155 | Topeka | PK Jan |
| 12/8/80 | Topeka Regional | 147 | Topeka | PK Jan |
| 1/8/81 | Parsons Regional | 170 | Parsons | PK Jan |
| 1/9/81 | Wichita Regional | 164 | Wichita | PK Jan |
| 3/26&27/81 | Third Annual Paraprofessional Conference | 436 | Topeka | PK Jan |
| 4/2&3/81 | Spring Facilitator Workshop | 60 | Hutchinson | PK Jan |

ATTACHMENT D

## COMMITTEES

| Date | Name of Committee | No. in Attendance | Coordinators | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 6/23/80 | Paraprofessional Planning Committee | 24 | PK | Jan |
| 7/30/80 | Paraprofessional Planning Committee | 27 | PK | Jan |
| 7/31/80 | Paraprofessional Advisory Council | 20 | PK | Jan |
| 1/15/81 | Paraprofessional Planning Committee | 29 | PK | Jan |
| 4/2/81 | Paraprofessional Advisory Council | 20 | PK | Jan |

ATTACHMENT E

## DISSEMINATION AND KANSAS PRESENTATIONS

| Date | Name of Presentation | No. in Attendance | Coordinators |
|---|---|---|---|
| 6/30/80 -7/1/80 | New York | | PK |
| 7/2/80 | New Jersey | | PK |
| 7/29/80 | *KNEA Summer Leadership Conference (Emporia) | 5 | Jan & PK |
| 8/18/80 | Para Workshop - Centre, Alabama | 27 | Jan & PK |
| 8/21/80 | *Orientation Inservice for Paras (Kansas City) | 75 | Jan |
| 9/4/80 | *Butler County Para Class (El Dorado) | 11 | Jan |
| 9/15&16/80 | National Task Force Meeting on Para Certif. | 20 | PK |
| 10/9&10/80 | Facilitator Workshop - Northville, Michigan | 15 | Jan & PK |
| 10/24/80 | *Presentation to regular & special education teachers - El Dorado | 18 | Jan |
| 12/15/80 | *KASB Convention | 20 | Jan |
| 12/16/80 | *KASB Convention | 15 | Jan |
| 1/14/81 | *Area Vocational/Technical School Directors Meeting | 15 | Jan |
| 1/16/81 | *Topeka #501 Paras | 81 | Jan |
| 2/5&6/81 | Workshop - Ogden, Utah | 100 | PK & Jan |
| 3/11-13/81 | National Para Conference - San Antonio, TX | 150 | PK & Jan |
| 4/15/81 | National CEC - New York | 30 | PK & Jan |
| 4/17/81 | National CEC - New York | 60 | Jan |
| 5/14-15/81 | Technical Assistance to the Louisiana State Department of Education | 10 | Jan & PK |
| 5/26/81 | *Needs Assessment for Para Program - Kansas City | 80 | Jan |

* = Kansas Presentations

## PARAPROFESSIONAL TRAINING MATERIALS

APPENDIX M

## MEDIA

| TITLE | TYPE OF MEDIA | TARGET AUDIENCE | AVAILABILITY |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. KANSAS FACILITATOR MODEL | SOUND SYNCHRONIZED SLIDES/CASSETTE | GENERAL ORIENTATION | NOW AVAILABLE |

- Explores the history and circumstances behind the increased responsibilities local schools now have for special education instruction and traces the evolution of the decentralized but state coordinated "facilitator model" in Kansas as a successful mechanism for the development, training, and maintenance of effective special education instructional paraprofessionals for local special education programs.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2. PUBLIC LAW 94-142 | SOUND SYNCHRONIZED SLIDES/CASSETTE | GENERAL ORIENTATION | NOW AVAILABLE |

- Explains new federal law dealing with the needs of handicapped children and the way in which use of special education instructional paraprofessionals can assist local education agencies in meeting the challenge and requirements of the various aspects of the new law (increased numbers, least restrictive environment, etc.)
- Reinforcement Activities (see Materials: Item 4)
    - a. Statutory Laws Which Relate to Paraprofessionals and Aides

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 3. PARAPROFESSIONALS: ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES | SOUND SYNCHRONIZED SLIDES/CASSETTE | GENERAL ORIENTATION | NOW AVAILABLE |

- Explains the overall concept and justification of the special education instructional paraprofessional. Also provides a detailed outline of the general roles and responsibilities of paraprofessionals in terms of the total task of teaching and caring for special education students, as well as in the I.E.P. process (development, implementation, and evaluation).
- Reinforcement Activities (see Materials: Item 4)
    - a. Task Cards. . . Do's and Don'ts
    - b. Start-Stop Sandwich
    - c. Task Cards (Skills, Abilities, and Duties)

| TITLE | TYPE OF MEDIA | TARGET AUDIENCE | AVAILABILITY |
|---|---|---|---|
| 4. GENERAL TEACHER TRAINING -- WORKING WITH A PARAPROFESSIONAL | SOUND SYNCHRONIZED SLIDES/CASSETTE | SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHERS | NOW AVAILABLE |

- Developed for special education teachers who are anticipating, just getting started, or currently working with special education instructional paraprofessionals. Deals with the basics of why, who, how, when, and likely benefits. Covers supervision and team development.
- Reinforcement Activities (see Materials: Item 4)
    a. Task Cards. . . Do's and Don'ts
    b. Start-Stop Sandwich
    c. Statutory Laws Which Relate to Paraprofessionals and Aides
    d. Program Development Sandwich
    e. Task Cards (Skills, Abilities, and Duties)

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 5. GENERAL PARA TRAINING -- COMMUNICATIONS | SOUND SYNCHRONIZED SLIDES/CASSETTE and PROGRAM GUIDE | PARAPROFESSIONALS | NOW AVAILABLE |

- Developed for use with both new and experienced paraprofessionals, this program aims at improving basic communication skills (listening, reflecting, summarizing, encouraging communications, motivating, verbal and nonverbal aspects, and more). Generally developed for approximately a 2-1/2 hour group training session but can be used for individual training and for shorter or longer sessions.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 6. GENERAL PARA TRAINING -- EDUCATIONAL ENVIRONMENT | SOUND SYNCHRONIZED SLIDES/CASSETTE and PROGRAM GUIDE | PARAPROFESSIONALS | NOW AVAILABLE |

- Developed for use with both new and experienced paraprofessionals, this program explains the importance of the total educational environment and how the use of various arrangements, materials, procedures and techniques can stimulate and facilitate the learning of special education students.
- Reinforcement Activities (see Materials: Item 4)
    a. Task Cards. . . Do's and Don'ts

| TITLE | TYPE OF MEDIA | TARGET AUDIENCE | AVAILABILITY |
|---|---|---|---|
| 7. GENERAL PARA TRAINING -- INSTRUCTIONAL PROCESS | SOUND SYNCHRONIZED SLIDES/CASSETTE and PROGRAM GUIDE | PARAPROFESSIONALS | NOW AVAILABLE |

- Developed for use with both new and experienced paraprofessionals, this program focuses on the instructional process and deals with the details of the overall roles and responsibilities of the paraprofessional in the process. Discusses helpful techniques and approaches.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 8. GENERAL PARA TRAINING -- CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT | SOUND SYNCHRONIZED SLIDES/CASSETTE and PROGRAM GUIDE | PARAPROFESSIONALS | NOW AVAILABLE |

- Developed for use with both new and experienced paraprofessionals, this program details the need for and several effective approaches for good classroom management. It provides the paraprofessional with an overview of various behavior or approaches that special education teachers might use and how to participate in and provide support for the teacher in his/her preferred approach.
- Reinforcement Activities (see Materials: Item 4)
    a. Task Cards. . . Do's and Don'ts
    b. Least Restrictive Behavior Management Sandwich

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 9. ORIENTATION FOR ADMINISTRATORS | SOUND SYNCHRONIZED SLIDES/CASSETTE | ADMINISTRATORS | NOW AVAILABLE |

- A synchronized slide-tape program approximately 20 minutes long that spells out, explains, and illustrates administrative aspects, laws, regulations, forms, procedures, and helpful directions in overseeing a paraprofessional program in a local school or co-op.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 10. PARAPROFESSIONALS: (WORKING WITH) LEARNING DISABLED & EMOTIONALLY DISTURBED STUDENTS | SOUND SYNCHRONIZED SLIDES/CASSETTE | PARAPROFESSIONALS | NOW AVAILABLE |

- A two-part, 22 minute synchronized slide-tape orientation and training program that covers Learning Disabled (11 minutes) and Emotionally Disturbed Students (11 minutes).

| | TITLE | TYPE OF MEDIA | TARGET AUDIENCE | AVAILABILITY |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 11. | PARAPROFESSIONALS: (WORKING WITH) EDUCABLE MENTALLY RETARDED, TRAINABLE MENTALLY RETARDED, AND SEVERELY MULTIPLY HANDICAPPED STUDENTS | SOUND SYNCHRONIZED SLIDES/CASSETTE | PARAPROFESSIONALS | NOW AVAILABLE |

- A three-part, 15-minute, synchronized slide-tape orientation and training program that covers Educable Mentally Retarded, Trainable Mentally Retarded, and Severely Multiply Handicapped.

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 12. | PARAPROFESSIONALS: (WORKING WITH) HEARING IMPAIRED, VISUALLY IMPAIRED, PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED, SPEECH & LANGUAGE HANDICAPPED, AND GIFTED STUDENTS | SOUND SYNCHRONIZED SLIDES/CASSETTE | PARAPROFESSIONALS | NOW AVAILABLE |

- A five-part, 25-minute synchronized slide-tape orientation and training program that covers Hearing Impaired (5 minutes), Visually Impaired (5 minutes), Physically Handicapped (5 minutes), Gifted (5 minutes), and Speech & Language Handicapped (5 minutes).

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 13. | PARAPROFESSIONALS: ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES INDEPENDENT ORIENTATION PACKAGE | SOUND SYNCHRONIZED FILMSTRIP/CASSETTE | GENERAL ORIENTATION | NOW AVAILABLE |

- Explains the overall concept and justification of the special education instructional paraprofessional. Also provides a detailed outline of the general roles and responsibilities of these paraprofessionals in terms of the total task of teaching and caring for special education students as well as in the I.E.P. process (development, implementation, and evaluation).
- Designed to be a self-administered program, this package includes instructions for use, activities, and supplementary reading information.

| | TITLE | TYPE OF MEDIA | TARGET AUDIENCE | AVAILABILITY |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 14. | THE PARAPROFESSIONAL IN SPECIAL EDUCATION WITH DR. LYMAN W. BOOMER | VIDEO TAPE | GENERAL ORIENTATION | FALL, 1981 |

- Practical definition and role of the special education paraprofessional. This 50-minute video program provides insight into situations which often face the special education paraprofessional. The presentation stresses the importance of paraprofessionals in special education team functions such as communication, behavior management, and development of instructional programs.

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 15. | VIDEO TAPE TRAINING SESSIONS FOR SPECIAL EDUCATION PARAPROFESSIONALS | VIDEO TAPE | PARAPROFESSIONALS | SPRING, 1981 |

- Ten 30-minute sessions which present typical problems paraprofessionals encounter in the special education classroom or program. Video format includes a role play practice session, and discussion of possible solutions.

## PRINTED MATERIALS

| | TITLE | TYPE OF MATERIAL | TARGET AUDIENCE | AVAILABILITY |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | GUIDELINES FOR THE TRAINING, UTILIZATION, & SUPERVISION OF PARAPROFESSIONALS & AIDES | PRINTED DOCUMENT (71 pages) | FACILITATORS, ADMINISTRATORS, TEACHERS, & PARAS | NOW AVAILABLE |

- Developed for Administrators, Teachers, and Teacher Assistants, this document outlines the role and responsibilities of special education instructional paraprofessionals, non-instructional paraprofessionals, and other aides.

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2. | GUIDELINES FOR ADMINISTRATION, TRAINING AND UTILIZATION OF PARAPROFESSIONALS IN SPECIAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS | PRINTED DOCUMENT | FACILITATORS, ADMINISTRATORS, TEACHERS, & PARAS | JANUARY, 1981 |

- Developed primarily for administrators, this document outlines administrative responsibilities (planning, employing, supervising, and evaluating paraprofessionals), statutory laws, role and responsibilities of paraprofessionals, training suggestions, and job descriptions for paraprofessionals in various categories of special education.

| TITLE | TYPE OF MATERIALS | TARGET AUDIENCE | AVAILABILITY |
|---|---|---|---|
| 3. FACILITATOR MODEL MANUAL | PRINTED DOCUMENT | FACILITATORS,<br>ADMINISTRATORS,<br>TEACHERS, & PARAS | NOW AVAILABLE |

- Primarily developed for state coordinators, this manual provides an explanation of the process, procedures, and programs in the Kansas program for paraprofessional training. Provides sample agendas, memos, training outlines, definitions, guidelines, and history which details evolution of the program.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 4. ACTIVITIES FOR REINFORCEMENT OF PARAPROFESSIONAL CONCEPTS | HANDS-ON ACTIVITIES AND GAMES | FACILITATORS,<br>ADMINISTRATORS,<br>TEACHERS, & PARAS | NOW AVAILABLE |

- Activities developed to reinforce ideas and concepts related to:
  - a. Paraprofessional Program Development
  - b. Paraprofessional Skill Areas

(These activities may be used with previously listed media packages.)

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 5. TRAINING MATERIALS PACKET | INFORMATION PORTFOLIO | FACILITATORS,<br>ADMINISTRATORS,<br>TEACHERS, & PARAS | NOW AVAILABLE |

- Sample packet of training materials used by project staff in workshops for paraprofessionals, administrators, and other trainers throughout the country.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 6. PARAPROFESSIONAL WORKSHOP HANDOUTS | RESOURCE LISTING | TRAINERS,<br>ADMINISTRATORS,<br>AND FACILITATORS | NOW AVAILABLE |

- For use by trainers, administrators, and facilitators. This listing details the paraprofessional resources available through the Kansas State Department of Education.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 7. PARAPROFESSIONAL INFORMATIONAL BOOKLET | BOOKLET | TRAINERS,<br>ADMINISTRATORS,<br>TEACHERS, & PARAS | NOW AVAILABLE |

- This 5-page booklet provides: a) an explanation of the instructional paraprofessional program in Kansas (including the facilitator model structure); b) a brief look at the role and responsibilities of a paraprofessional; c) an overview of results and an outline of assistance available through the program; and d) a partial listing of training materials for use by administrators and educators involved in paraprofessional programs.

# EVALUATION REPORT

1979 - 1980

# A STATEWIDE NETWORK FOR SPECIAL EDUCATION PARAPROFESSIONAL TRAINING

(Second Year of Project)

Kansas State Department of Education

Topeka, Kansas

by

Larry L. Havlicek

Evaluator

of Project

The University of Kansas

Phyllis Kelly,
Project Director

G007801422
Grant Number

## INTRODUCTION

As delineated in the original proposal, a two-level evaluation system was used to evaluate the Statewide Network for Special Education Paraprofessional Training program. The first level evaluation involved an internal program evaluation which was done by the program staff. This was mainly the documentation of the process objectives and the interviews of teachers and paraprofessionals. The second level was done by the contracted evaluator and included the evaluation of all of the workshops and the performance objectives. Both formative and summative evaluation procedures were used during the fiscal year, and evaluation reports submitted during the year will be summarized in this final evaluation report.

This Final Evaluation Report will follow the same order as the objectives were stated in the Program Evaluation Plan. Thus, the process objectives will be reported first followed by the performance objectives.

## PROCESS OBJECTIVES

There were a total of 14 process objectives to be accomplished during the past fiscal year. The first objective was:

> 1. During the second year of the program, two two-day meetings and three one-day meetings will be held by program staff with facilitators on a regional basis to refine competencies for paraprofessionals and their skills.

"New" facilitators were provided three workshops each lasting at least one day. Two two-day workshops were held for all facilitators to attend. Thus, the objective, as stated, was met.

The second process objective was:

> 2. During the second year of the program, project staff will make follow-up visitations to districts to check on the effectiveness of the inservice training of paraprofessionals. Interviews will be conducted with district personnel in 25 districts during the year...

This objective was met, since visitations and interviews were conducted in 27 districts. During these visits, 23 facilitators were interviewed, 125 paraprofessionals were interviewed, and 88 supervising teachers were interviewed. Documentation to support these interviews is available through the On-site Visitation Reports.

Process objective #3 was:

> 3. During the second year of the program, a cataloging system will be developed by program staff as a means of disseminating information to participating districts.

A cataloging system was developed during the year and was put into operation as evidenced by the following in-state slide-tape requests: Roles and Responsibilities (16), Kansas Facilitator Model (2), P.L. 94-142 (8), Teacher Training (11), Communications (20), Educational Environment (11), Instructional Process (11), and Classroom Management (20). In addition to the above requests which were filled, approximately 700 Paraprofessional Guidelines were sent out to educators in the state, and approximately 20 Facilitator Model Manuals were distributed. Thus, this objective was not only met but was also fully operationalized.

The fourth process objective was:

> 4. During the second year of the program, program staff will continue to cooperate with paraprofessionals in severely multiply handicapped programs as evidenced by a record of each contact.

A total of 16 contacts were made during the year at various meetings both within the state and outside of the state. Many of these contacts were at statewide meetings which were attended by a large number of special educators. Six of the contacts were at regional workshops during which special sessions were conducted for the SMH paraprofessionals. This objective was and is documented by meeting logs, agendas, and meeting notices.

The fifth objective was:

> 5. During the year, program staff will prepare and distribute 3 newsletters.

This objective was met as evidenced by three newsletters which were distributed in October 1979, February and May 1980.

The sixth objective was:

> 6. During the second year of the program, program staff will disseminate information pertinent to the paraprofessional training program on a national basis at workshops for other special educators throughout the country.

This objective was met. Workshops were conducted during the year at Cushing, Oklahoma; Columbia, South Carolina; Cedar Rapids, Iowa; Gainesville, Florida; Mason City, Iowa; Ann Arbor, Michigan; Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; Montgomery, Alabama; and Washington, D.C.

The seventh objective was:

> 7. During the second year of the program, program staff will continue to work with community college, area vocational-technical school, and private college deans on the development of curricula and Associate of Arts programs for training paraprofessionals.

This objective was met as evidenced by contacts with Butler County Community College, Labette Community College, Pratt Community College, and community colleges in Dodge City, Kansas City, and Highland. The outcomes of these meetings and contacts were the development of three paraprofessional programs and coursework in three of the above listed colleges and proposals pending in the others listed. Also, there are now representatives on the Paraprofessional Advisory Council from these colleges.

Process objective eight was:

> 8. During the second year of the program, program staff will continue to interact with four-year college special educators in developing training programs on the utilization of paraprofessionals in their training programs.

This objective was met. Contacts were made at two of the four-year colleges within the state; Wichita State University and Washburn University. The other four-year colleges participated in workshops and are in the process of incorporating aspects of the paraprofessional training program into their teacher training programs.

The ninth process objective was:

> 9. During the second year of the program, program staff will facilitate the establishment of the Approval Process for special education paraprofessionals in at least 50% of the school districts in Kansas.

Approval Process for special education paraprofessionals was put into effect in all Kansas School districts. A total of 1201 Level I, 181 Level II, and 221 Level III permits were awarded during the year. This involved 100% of all school districts in Kansas. Thus the objective was met as stated.

The tenth process objective was:

> 10. During the second year of the program, program staff will hold two statewide paraprofessional conferences.

One statewide paraprofessional conference was held as well as eight regional paraprofessional workshops, one statewide SMH workshop which included paraprofessionals, and six SMH and Physically Impaired Regional Workshops which included paraprofessionals. Thus, this objective was met and is documented by agendas and role sheets.

Process objective number eleven was:

> 11. During the second year of the program, program staff will continue to maintain the "hot line."

This objective was met since the "hot line" was continued during the year. Approximately 900 phone calls were received, including 235 calls pertinent to paraprofessionals, 115 regarding the approval process, 380 about the workshops, 97 about the paraprofessional media, and 18 regarding the newsletters. Thus, this objective was met and is documented by consultation logs kept by staff of 844 paraprofessional calls within the state during the year, and 61 out-of-state calls.

Process objective number twelve was:

> 12. During the second year of the program, program staff will disseminate training and field test materials (modules) and media through the New Careers Training Laboratory and evaluate those materials and programs sent out.

This objective was met. Approximately 300 Paraprofessional Guidelines were sent out of state as well as 315 Facilitator Model Manuals. A total of 57 slide-tapes were sent out of state at requests of educators from throughout the nation. Thus, this objective was met and is documented by request logs kept by staff and media evaluation forms.

Process Objective thirteen was:

> 13. During the second year of the program, program staff will conduct six one-day workshops for teachers in order to improve their effectiveness in working with paraprofessionals.

Nine such workshops were conducted. Workshops were presented at Topeka, Parsons State Hospital, Great Bend, Wichita, Lawrence, Oskaloosa, Shawnee Mission, and the Capper Foundation. Thus, this objective was met and can be documented by agendas and role sheets.

Process objective fourteen was:

> 14. During the second year of the program, program staff will be available to meet with state department and special educators throughout the nation to explain the paraprofessional training program.

This objective was met, since program staff met with state department representatives from Iowa, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Florida, Michigan, Pennsylvania, Alabama, Colorado, and West Virginia. Documentation for this objective is on file through consultation logs and formalized agendas.

In summary, all of the fourteen process objectives were completely met and are well documented. Thus, it can be concluded that the program met the process objectives with regard to program implementation.

## PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES

There were three major performance objectives to be met during the past year. For each objective, a number of scales were used to measure the performance level delineated in the objective. The results of the evaluation for each objective will be presented in tables with interpretation for each of the three objectives in the following section. The first performance objective was:

> 1. During the second year of the program, a random sample of 50 paraprofessionals who have been trained in the program will demonstrate competency in paraprofessional skills by being rated on the average higher than 2.5 on a five-point rating scale of performance developed from the list of skills for paraprofessionals.

In order to determine whether or not this objective was met, a 15-item "Paraprofessional Rating Scale" was developed. This scale was completed by 120 paraprofessionals as a self-rating of their skills, and by 138 supervisors of paraprofessionals. The mean ratings for each of the two groups are presented in Table 1 which also includes the results of the t test analyses comparing the means of the two groups.

The rating scale was set up so that a high rating (5) indicated excellent skill, (4) very good skill, (3) adequate skill, (2) some improvement needed, and (1) major improvement needed. Table 1 also indicates the number of times that each item was rated by both the supervisors and the paraprofessionals. Thus, item 1 was rated 137 times by supervisors and 118 times by paraprofessioanls as a self-appraisal. The mean rating for the supervisors was 4.08 and the mean rating for paraprofessionals was 3.87. The t test indicated that the means were not significantly different, since the t value of 1.98 was not significant at the .05 level of significance.

## TABLE I

## PARAPROFESSIONAL RATING SCALE

| Item | Paras n | Paras Mean | Supervisors n | Supervisors Mean | t |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Effective in working with students in: | | | | | |
| one-to-one situations | 118 | 3.87 | 137 | 4.08 | 1.98 |
| small group activities | 111 | 3.75 | 109 | 3.92 | 3.75** |
| large group activities | 88 | 3.03 | 68 | 3.57 | 3.03** |
| 2. Interpersonal relations | | | | | |
| with supervising teacher | 119 | 3.99 | 132 | 4.17 | 1.36 |
| with program staff | 102 | 3.50 | 108 | 3.91 | 3.32** |
| with regular staff | 108 | 3.53 | 106 | 3.93 | 3.24** |
| 3. Using equipment/materials | 50 | 3.54 | 56 | 3.98 | 2.45* |
| 4. Using educ. techniques | 111 | 3.49 | 131 | 3.86 | 3.35** |
| 5. Managing students through: | | | | | |
| use of classroom skills | 113 | 3.37 | 125 | 3.57 | 1.67 |
| use of reinforcement skills | 115 | 3.48 | 132 | 3.79 | 2.74** |
| 6. Demonstrating understanding of exceptional students | 108 | 3.63 | 130 | 3.99 | 3.11** |
| 7. Preparation skills: | | | | | |
| classroom materials | 110 | 3.81 | 120 | 4.14 | 3.11** |
| classroom environments | 106 | 3.48 | 110 | 3.96 | 4.20** |
| 8. Skill in operating: | | | | | |
| office equipment | 100 | 3.45 | 82 | 3.78 | 2.38* |
| Audio-visual equipment | 85 | 3.17 | 80 | 3.63 | 3.10** |

*Significant at .05 **Significant at .01 level

As can be noted in Table I above, the objective was met for all of the 15 items on the rating scale.

All of the means were above 2.5, the criterion set to meet the objective. Thus, the objective was completely met. As can be noted in the table, the highest self-rating for the paraprofessionals was their perception of their skill in interpersonal relationships in communicating with supervising teachers. The skill in which they rated themselves lowest in was their effectiveness in working with students in large group situations. The supervisors rated the paraprofessionals highest in their interpersonal relations skills in communicating with supervising teachers, and lowest in their large group activities skills and in their managing students through use of classroom management skills.

As can also be noted from Table 1, the supervisors rated the skills higher than the paraprofessionals rated their skills. This was consistent for all of the items. The t test indicated that the supervisors' ratings were significantly higher on 10 items at the .01 and for an additional 2 items at the .05 level of significance. Thus, the supervisors rated the paraprofessionals significantly higher on 12 of the 15 items.

Thus as indicated before, the objective was met for all items since the mean ratings were consistently higher than 2.5 for all items.

The second performance objective was:

> 2. During the second year of the program, a random sample of 50 paraprofessionals who have been trained in the program will demonstrate a positive attitude toward understanding the characteristics of the special education student they will be working with as measured by a Likert-type rating scale.

After the first year of the project and a study conducted on attitudes of paraprofessionals, teachers, and administrators, project staff and the external evaluator felt it necessary to do a follow-up study and to substitute the following performance objective for the original performance objective number two:

During the second year of the project, a random sample of paraprofessionals, teachers, and administrators will demonstrate general agreement on issues selected from a previous attitudinal questionnaire because of respondent nonagreement.

A 22-item attitude scale was used to evaluate this objective. The mean responses for a random sample of 224 paraprofessionals, 166 teachers, and 96 administrators are presented in Table 2.

## TABLE 2

## MEAN ATTITUDES TOWARD PARAPROFESSIONAL PROGRAMS AND TRAINING

| Item | Paras | Teachers | Administ. |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Paras should perform duties outside of the classroom. | 2.85 | 3.04 | 3.70 |
| 2. Each para should be trained to work specifically with one category of exceptionality. | 2.65 | 2.96 | 2.50 |
| 3. Paras should be treated as professionals by district. | 4.27 | 4.38 | 3.88 |
| 4. Paras should receive at least one week of pre-service training. | 4.09 | 4.22 | 3.38 |
| 5. Paras should be offered a formal contract. | 4.33 | 4.23 | 3.96 |
| 6. Para training should emphasize subject matter skills. | 3.81 | 3.45 | 3.40 |
| 7. Teachers should utilize paras in diagnosing educational needs and planning programs. | 3.75 | 3.32 | 2.66 |
| 8. Some paras can be used to provide relief at peak times of the year and should receive short-term pay. | 3.33 | 3.18 | 3.03 |
| 9. Paras should be encouraged to take college courses. | 3.73 | 3.82 | 3.95 |
| 10. Inservice training programs for paras should be offered in coordination with a college. | 3.89 | 3.83 | 3.50 |
| 11. The most important characteristic of a successful para is the ability to get along with the teacher | 3.65 | 3.57 | 3.52 |
| 12. Paras should receive training in organizational skills. | 3.80 | 3.80 | 3.98 |
| 13. Paras should view themselves as professionals. | 4.49 | 4.40 | 4.03 |

TABLE 2
(Continued)

| Item | Paras | Teachers | Administ. |
|---|---|---|---|
| 14. The state government has a statutory obligation to be involved with special education paraprofessionals. | 4.00 | 3.76 | 3.74 |
| 15. Teachers should treat paraprofessionals as equals. | 3.92 | 3.98 | 3.15 |
| 16. Teachers are unprepared to work with paras on the basis of their college training. | 3.14 | 3.20 | 3.65 |
| 17. Teachers must be directly involved in on-the-job training of paras conducted by their district. | 3.72 | 3.91 | 3.78 |
| 18. Administrators and teachers should involve paras in extra-curricular events. | 3.47 | 3.58 | 3.52 |
| 19. Community college pre-service para training programs should involve teachers as well as paras. | 3.81 | 3.75 | 3.50 |
| 20. The primary responsibility of the para is to make the teacher's job easier. | 2.89 | 2.51 | 2.05 |
| 21. Paras should receive college training in education methods. | 3.56 | 3.39 | 2.81 |
| 22. Paras should be paid at a rate of approximately one-half of a special education teacher's salary. | 3.56 | 3.39 | 2.81 |

The response codes were strongly agree = 5, agree = 4, neutral = 3, disagree = 2, and strongly disagree = 1. As shown in the table above items 1, 3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 18, 19, and 22 are issues still not generally agreed upon.

The third performance objective was:

> 3. During the second year of the program, the materials and media that have been developed and field tested will be rated as appropriate for training paraprofessionals by one-half of the teachers and supervisors sampled to evaluate these materials.

To evaluate this objective, several rating scales were used dependent upon the type of material and media to be rated. The first rating scale that was used was to rate the paraprofessional training programs. There were six programs that were evaluated. The results are presented in Table 3 which tabulates the responses for each of the six programs and then for all programs combined. For the listings in the table, the programs are identified as follows: 1 = Instructional Process; 2 = Educational Environment; 3 = Roles and Responsibilities; 4 = PL 94-142; 5 = Communications, and 6 = Classroom Management. The responses for each question will be presented in Table 3 for each of the six programs and then for programs combined. The number of ratings turned in for each program was: 1, n = 33; 2, n = 19, 3, n= 16; 4, n = 24; 5, n = 39, and 6, n = 96. A total of 227 rating forms were tabulated.

The responses to the last question are most pertinent to the objective, and indicate that the objective was met. When asked to rate the training programs, the majority of the paraprofessionals rated the programs as a grade of "A" or "B". The mean grade for all programs was above the midpoint "C" grade, with the scale being "A" = 1, "B" = 2, etc. Also, the majority of the paraprofessionals would recommend using the programs for the training of other paraprofessionals. In addition to these two items which clearly indicate that the objective was met, the majority of the paraprofessionals using and rating these training programs felt that the programs were interesting and provided them with workable ideas and a better understanding of their duties. Thus, the training programs can be considered to be effective in the training of paraprofessionals from the point of view of the ratings of the paraprofessionals who used these programs in their own training.

In addition to the ratings completed by the paraprofessionals who were trained through the use of the training materials and whose ratings were tabulatd in Table 3, facilitators, trainers, and teachers were also asked to rate the training materials and the audio-visual programs that were developed by the program. Four rating forms were developed for this purpose, and these will be tabulated in the following tables.

The first tabulation is for the rating of the paraprofessional training program by trainers and facilitators. A total of 42 evaluation forms were tabulated and are presented in Table 4. As indicated in Table 4, most of the trainer/facilitators indicated that the program did assist them in orienting and training paraprofessionals, that the programs were well received by the paraprofessionals as well as teachers, administrators, and support personnel, and that the programs were very relevant. Thus, the trainers/facilitators rated the paraprofessionals training programs very highly.

## TABLE 3

## PARAPROFESSIONAL's EVALUATION OF TRAINING PROGRAMS

| Question | Responses | PROGRAM* | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | All |
| How interesting did you find the program to be? | Very interesting | 12 | 7 | 3 | 7 | 9 | 23 | 61 |
| | Interesting | 16 | 12 | 10 | 12 | 30 | 53 | 133 |
| | So-So | 5 | | 3 | 5 | | 17 | 30 |
| | Uninteresting | | | | | | 3 | 3 |
| | Dull | | | | | | | |
| | Mean Rating | 1.8 | 1.6 | 2.0 | 1.9 | 1.8 | 2.0 | 1.9 |
| To what extent did the program provide you with a better understanding and workable ideas? | A good deal | 17 | 9 | 4 | 11 | 12 | 20 | 73 |
| | Provided some | 15 | 9 | 10 | 13 | 24 | 58 | 129 |
| | ? | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | 8 | 11 |
| | Little | 1 | | 1 | | 2 | 9 | 13 |
| | Nothing | | | | | | 1 | 1 |
| | Mean Rating | 1.6 | 1.6 | 1.9 | 1.5 | 1.8 | 2.1 | 1.9 |
| How difficult was the material presented? | Very difficult | | | | | | 2 | 2 |
| | Rather difficult | 3 | | | 3 | 1 | 3 | 10 |
| | So-So | 6 | | 1 | 7 | 5 | 27 | 46 |
| | Rather easy | 20 | 11 | 9 | 10 | 21 | 50 | 121 |
| | Very easy | 4 | 8 | 6 | 3 | 12 | 12 | 45 |
| | Mean Rating | 3.8 | 4.4 | 4.3 | 3.6 | 4.1 | 3.7 | 3.9 |
| How many times do you feel that the program needs to be viewed in order to master the concepts? | Once | 20 | 13 | 6 | 9 | 26 | 41 | 115 |
| | Two times | 11 | 5 | 8 | 11 | 8 | 40 | 83 |
| | More | 1 | 1 | | 2 | 3 | 9 | 15 |
| | ? | 1 | | 1 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 12 |
| | Mean Rating | 1.5 | 1.4 | 1.9 | 1.9 | 1.5 | 1.8 | 1.7 |

## TABLE 3
## (Continued)

| Question | Responses | PROGRAM | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | All |
| Would you recommend this program for use in the training of other paraprofessionals? | Yes | 33 | 19 | 15 | 23 | 37 | 82 | 209 |
| | ? | | | | 1 | 2 | 12 | 15 |
| | No | | | 1 | | | 2 | 3 |
| | Mean Rating | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.2 | 1.0 | 1.1 | 1.2 | 1.1 |
| How would you grade this program as a training/orientation for paras? | A | 14 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 18 | 31 | 90 |
| | B | 16 | 7 | 6 | 10 | 15 | 42 | 96 |
| | C | 3 | 3 | 1 | 5 | 4 | 16 | 32 |
| | D | | | | | | 5 | 5 |
| | F | | | | | | 1 | 1 |
| | ? | | | | | | | |
| | Mean Rating | 1.7 | 1.7 | 1.5 | 1.8 | 1.6 | 2.0 | 1.8 |

*Programs:
1 = Instructional Process (n = 33)
2 = Educational Environment (N = 19)
3 = Roles and Responsibilities (n = 16)
4 = PL 94-142 (n = 24)
5 = Communications (n = 39)
6 = Classroom Management (n = 96)

## TABLE 4
## TRAINER/FACILITATOR RATINGS OF PARAPROFESSIONAL TRAINING PROGRAMS

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Was the program of significant assistance in orienting and training paras? | Very much so | 12 |
| | Yes | 26 |
| | Somewhat | 1 |
| | No | 1 |
| | ? | |
| | MEAN RESPONSE | 1.78 |
| How was the program received by paraprofessionals? | Very well | 13 |
| | Well | 20 |
| | Mixed | 4 |
| | Not well | 1 |
| | MEAN RESPONSE | 1.82 |
| If viewed by teachers, administrators, or other support personnel, how was the program received? | Not viewed | 18 |
| | Very well | 4 |
| | Well | 5 |
| | Mixed | 1 |
| | Not well | 1 |
| | MEAN RESPONSE | 2.13 |
| Length of program? | Much too long | |
| | Too long | 1 |
| | About right | 39 |
| | Too brief | 2 |
| | Much too brief | |
| | MEAN RESPONSE | 3.02 |
| Overall relevance: | Very relevant | 23 |
| | Relevant | 17 |
| | So-So | 2 |
| | Not relevant | |
| | ? | |
| | MEAN RESPONSE | 1.50 |
| Accuracy of content: | Very accurate | 16 |
| | Accurate | 21 |
| | So-So | 1 |
| | Not Accurate | |
| | ? | 1 |
| | MEAN RESPONSE | 1.69 |

TABLE 4
(Continued)

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Clarity of concepts: | Very Clear | 20 |
| | Clear | 17 |
| | Mixed | 2 |
| | Unclear | |
| | ? | 1 |
| | MEAN RESPONSE | 1.54 |
| Completeness: | Very Complete | 13 |
| | Complete | 21 |
| | So-So | 4 |
| | Incomplete | 1 |
| | ? | |
| | MEAN RESPONSE | 1.82 |

The second tabulation is presented in Table 5 and is for the responses of trainers/facilitators to the evaluation of the audio-visual programs. As can be noted in the table, the majority of the responses to the first item dealing with whether or not the program was of significant assistance to them in training paraprofessionals was very positive. Likewise, other items were also responded to in a very positive way indicating that the trainers/facilitators thought that the audio-visual programs were effective, well received, relevant, accurate with regard to content, clear and complete. However, they tended to rate the audio-visuals as being too long. Possibly these programs should be reviewed and shortened in length, if this is possible to do without reducing the effectiveness of these programs.

TABLE 5

TRAINER/FACILITATOR RATINGS OF

AUDIO-VISUAL PROGRAMS

| | | | MEAN |
|---|---|---|---|
| Was the program of significant assistance in orienting and training paraprofessionals? | Very much so | 6 | |
| | Yes | 3 | |
| | Somewhat | 3 | 1.50 |
| How was the program received by teachers? | Very well | 6 | |
| | Well received | 1 | |
| | Mixed | 5 | 1.83 |
| If viewed by administrators or support personnel, how was the program received? | Not viewed | 6 | |
| | Very well received | 2 | |
| | Well received | 4 | 1.67 |
| Length of program: | Much too long | 6 | |
| | Too long | 1 | |
| | About right | 5 | 2.83 |
| Overall relevance: | Very relevant | 6 | |
| | Relevant | 2 | |
| | So-So | 4 | 1.67 |
| Accuracy of content: | Very accurate | 4 | |
| | Accurate | 3 | |
| | So-So | 1 | 1.25 |
| Clarity of concepts: | Very clear | 5 | |
| | Clear | 2 | |
| | Mixed | 3 | 1.60 |
| Completeness: | Very complete | 4 | |
| | Complete | 1 | |
| | So-So | 3 | 1.75 |

The third tabulation was for the evaluation of audio-visual training programs by teachers, facilitators, administrators, and other support persons. A total of 10 evaluations were tabulated and the results are presented in Table 6. As can be noted in Table 6, most of the responses indicated that the programs were very informative, provided assistance in conveying concepts to others, were relevant, clear, accurate, and complete.

The last tabulation presented in Table 6 is for teachers' ratings of the audio-visual programs designed for training them in various aspects of the paraprofessional program. As noted in Table 6, most of the responses indicated that the teaches felt that these audio-visual programs were of assistance to them in working with paraprofessionals, were well done, relevant, clear, complete, and accurate.

## TABLE 6

### AUDIO-VISUAL PROGRAMS
### TEACHER TRAINING ORIENTATION

| | | | Mean |
|---|---|---|---|
| Was the program of significant assistance in orienting and training paraprofessionals? | Very much so | 2 | |
| | Yes | 7 | |
| | Somewhat | 1 | 1.90 |
| How would you evaluate this program overall? | Very well done | 2 | |
| | Well done | 6 | |
| | So-So | 2 | 2.00 |
| Length of program: | Much too long | 0 | |
| | Too long | 4 | |
| | About right | 6 | 2.60 |
| Overall relevance: | Very relevant | 3 | |
| | Relevant | 7 | 1.70 |
| Accuracy of content: | Very accurate | 4 | |
| | Accurate | 6 | 1.60 |
| Clarity of concepts: | Very clear | 2 | |
| | Clear | 7 | |
| | Mixed | 1 | 1.90 |
| Completeness: | Very complete | 1 | |
| | Complete | 8 | |
| | So-So | 1 | 2.00 |

It should be noted that in the previous four tables, only response categories for which there were frequencies were reported. Negative categories which did not receive any tallies were not included in the tables. For example, the second question above included the category of Not well done, but this was not checked by any of the teachers.

In reference to the previous four tables, it can be concluded that the ratings of the training programs and the audio-visual programs indicate that these programs were judged to be effective, of assistance in orienting and training paraprofessionals, relevant to the paraprofessional program, accurate, clear, and complete. Thus, this objective was met as evaluated by the responses of those using the programs. All of the mean response ratings were above the mid-point of the rating scale which was the criterion set in the objective. Thus the objective was met for all programs that were developed and evaluated.

In addition to the 14 process and 3 major performance objectives evaluated at the end of the year, an evaluation was done for each of the workshops that were presented during the year. All of these evaluations indicated that the participants were satisfied with what was accomplished at each workshop, how presentations were made, how the workshops were organized, and the topics presented. Thus the feedback information obtained from each of the workshops was very positive and indicated that the workshops were beneficial to the participants. Since these evaluations were mainly formative in nature to provide feedback with regard to what changes might be necessary for the workshops, they are not included as part of this report. However, the reports can be reviewed for pertinent comments and evaluations of each of the workshops that were presented during the year.

# SUMMARY

During the second year of the Statewide Network for Special Education Paraprofessional Training program, there were 14 process objectives and 3 performance objectives to be accomplished. As indicated in this report, all of the 14 process objectives were met and are documented.

The three performance objectives were met and are documented. The evaluation evidence presented for each objective surpassed the criterion level of performance set for each objective. Thus, the program was effective in attaining each of the performance objectives set for the program during the year.

In addition to the end-of-the-year evaluation, each workshop was evaluated using a post-meeting reaction/rating scale. The results of these evaluations indicated that the workshops were well received, were effective in training paraprofessionals, teachers, and facilitators/trainers, and were viewed in a very positive way. Thus, it can be concluded that the program was very effective in meeting the objectives set for the second year of the program.

GRANT NO. G007801422
CFDA: 13.451B

# A STATEWIDE NETWORK FOR SPECIAL EDUCATION PARAPROFESSIONAL TRAINING

## EVALUATION REPORT 1978-79

This Evaluation Report for the 1978-79 fiscal year will summarize the accomplishments and activities which were planned for the first year of the Statewide Network for Special Education Paraprofessional Training project and its impact on education in the State of Kansas. The report will be divided into three sections. The first section deals with the 14 process objectives to be accomplished during the first year of the project. The next section deals with the three performance objectives. The final section presents the evaluation reports for each of the workshops and conferences held during the first year. These reports have been provided by the external evaluator for the project and have mainly been formative in nature in that they have summarized the reactions of the participants to these workshops and have provided information pertinent to changes that are needed to make the workshops more effective. However, these evaluations also yield information regarding the effectiveness of the workshops in bringing about changes in various aspects of the paraprofessional training program and its effectiveness. In general, the responses for all workshops were very positive and the participants felt that what they had received from these workshops was both very important and would be useful to them in their duties as supervisors, facilitators, or paraprofessionals. Thus, it appears that the workshops were very effective in updating skills and information pertinent to the entire program.

## SECTION I

## PROCESS OBJECTIVES

THE FIRST PROCESS OBJECTIVE WAS:

1. During the first year of the program, six one-day regional meetings will be conducted by program staff for superintendents and principals to delineate new developments and refinements pertinent to the role of the special education paraprofessional. Documentation for this objective will include the date and site for these meetings, an agenda for the meeting, and a roster of participants.

During the first year of the program, five one-day regional meetings were conducted for paraprofessionals, administrators, and teachers. These sessions were on the following dates at the listed sites. The number of participants is given for each workshop. Agendas are included in Appendix A. Rosters of participants are on file at the Kansas State Department of Education office.

| DATE | SITE | # OF PARTICIPANTS |
|---|---|---|
| September 23, 1978 | Topeka, Ks. | 142 |
| October 12, 1978 | Dodge City, Ks. | 73 |
| October 13, 1978 | Hays, Ks. | 79 |
| October 30, 1978 | Wichita, Ks. | 242 |
| November 3, 1978 | Parsons, Ks. | 96 |

In addition, program staff presented a mini-workshop for superintendents and other central office staff at the United School Administrators Conference in Wichita on January 25, 1979. Approximately 50 administrators were present. Verification is by the program agenda available in the Special Education office.

THE SECOND PROCESS OBJECTIVE WAS:

2. During the first year of the program, the facilitators' program will be expanded to include all districts/cooperatives as documented by a listing of new districts/cooperatives that have become involved in the program during the Fiscal Year 1978.

The Facilitators Program expanded in 1978-79 to include 59 districts/cooperatives. This was an increase of 7 over the previous year. (A listing of "old" and "new" facilitators is included in Appendix B.)

Card #2

THE THIRD AND SIXTH PROCESS OBJECTIVES WERE:

3. During the first year of the program, program staff will develop a training package for facilitators' based upon paraprofessional training needs in the districts/cooperatives as documented by the training package filed in the Central Data File for the program.

6. During the first year of the program, half of the proposed training modules will be developed by program staff. These will cover accepted statewide competencies and training skills necessary to meet those competencies as evidenced by the training materials on file in the Central Data File. The program staff will contract with an outside firm to develop these training materials and media as evidenced by such materials collected in the Central Data File.

During the first year of the program, program staff, with the assistance of an outside firm, developed five sets of training media and materials. The packages were developed from a statewide survey of competencies (n = 900) and input from the state facilitators and advisory board. ~~Form of~~ the packages contain a slide/tape presentation and an accompanying manual. One package for teachers contains only the slide/tape as ~~the manual~~ is still in preparation.

Card #4

THE FOURTH PROCESS OBJECTIVE WAS:

4. During the first year of the program, the program staff will conduct three (3) one-day and one two-day facilitators' workshops documented by the date and site for these workshops, the agenda for each workshop, and a roster of participants.

During the first year of the program, the program staff conducted three (3) facilitators workshops, one (1) for one day and two (2) for two days. The following are dates, sites, and attendance at each workshop:

| DATE | SITE | # OF PARTICIPANTS |
|---|---|---|
| September 22, 1978 | Topeka, Ks. | 20 |
| November 9 & 10, 1978 | Hutchinson, Ks. | 62 |
| February 22 & 23, 1979 | Wichita, Ks. | 42 |

In addition, facilitators attended their respective regional workshops and several attended the Statewide Paraprofessional Workshop. Verification of attendance is on rosters filed in the Special Education Office. (Agendas of facilitator workshops are in Appendix C.)

THE FIFTH PROCESS OBJECTIVE WAS:

5. During the first year of the program, program staff will conduct 15 on-site visits at school districts involved in the Facilitators' Model as evidenced by a listing of dates and sites of these visits, rosters of personnel interviewed, and a composite report of all 15 visits.

Program staff conducted 11 on-site visits at school districts involved in the Facilitator Model. A composite report of the 11 site visits, summation of interview data, and other pertinent information is found as part of the response to performance objective one.

THE SIXTH PROCESS OBJECTIVE WAS COVERED WITH THE THIRD PROCESS OBJECTIVE.

THE SEVENTH PROCESS OBJECTIVE WAS:

7. During the first year of the program, the program staff will field-test the material and media developed for the program in one-half of the districts participating in the training module.

During the first year of the program, the media and materials package was utilized in 28 of the districts participating in the Model. Further data on client satisfaction is found in the response to performance objective three.

THE EIGHT PROCESS OBJECTIVE WAS:

8. During the first year of the program, program staff will continue to cooperate with paraprofessional programs emphasizing services to the severely handicapped as evidenced by communications and contacts with severely multiply handicapped paraprofessionals developed during the past year.

Program staff continued their involvement with paraprofessionals in SMH programs during 1978-79 by involving them in regional and statewide workshops specifically for the SMH paraprofessional. Special discussion sessions were held for the paraprofessional in an SMH program and two workshops were conducted at Parsons State Hospital and Winfield State Hospital. Verification of these activities is available through agendas and roster data filed in the Special Education Office.

THE NINTH PROCESS OBJECTIVE WAS:

9. During the first year of the program, program staff will expand the scope of the quarterly Paraprofessional Newsletter as evidenced by copies of the current newsletters so that comparisons can be made with previous newsletters.

Program staff expanded the scope and content of the Paraprofessional Newsletter as evidenced by copies of the 1978-79 newsletter found in Appendix D.

THE TENTH PROCESS OBJECTIVE WAS:

10. During the first year of the program, program staff will conduct six (6) one-day regional meetings with Community college personnel to discuss the development and implementation of programs for training paraprofessionals as documented by dates and places of those meetings, agenda, and attendance rosters for each meeting.

To meet this objective, a one (1) day workshop was conducted in Topeka on September 21, 1978, with 12 persons attending. The director of community college programs suggested one full day of workshop rather than six (6) regional workshops to facilitate more interaction among the various regions. A copy of the agenda is found in Appendix E.

THE ELEVENTH PROCESS OBJECTIVE WAS:

11. During the first year of the program, program staff will hold four (4) one-day meetings with college special educators to discuss their role in paraprofessional training as documented by dates and places of those meetings, agenda, and attendance rosters for each meeting.

Program staff met with college special education classes at the following locations:

Fort Hays State University, Hays, Kansas
The University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas (2 classes)
Washburn University, Topeka, Kansas
Pittsburg State University, Pittsburg, Kansas
Emporia State University, Emporia, Kansas
Benedictine College, Atchison, Kansas

Verification of dates is available on request.

THE TWELFTH PROCESS OBJECTIVE WAS:

12. During the first year of the program, the services of KEDDS will be utilized to disseminate information about the paraprofessional program throughout the state and to education departments in other states as documented by listings of requests for paraprofessional information and listings of information sent out.

Program staff submitted information regarding available technical assistance and media and materials to KEDDS staff. In addition, materials were sent to 24 persons and/or programs throughout Kansas and the United States. Media were sent for use to 4 persons and/or programs throughout the country. In addition, 13 workshops were conducted for individual districts in Kansas and 7 programs around the country.

## PROPOSED ACTIVITIES

1. Statewide Paraprofessional Conference. At least one statewide paraprofessional conference will be held to emphasize communication among paraprofessionals and to develop professional skills. These conferences will feature national leaders in the field of special education and paraprofessional/aide training.

Kansas conducted the first statewide Conference for Paraprofessionals in the United States in Topeka on March 30 and 31, 1979. Approximately 350 persons were in attendance. Appendix F contains the agenda for this conference.

2. An Advisory Committee for the Grant. An advisory group will be formed to assist with decision making and evaluation data on the grant's activities. The members will be from the following constituents: paraprofessionals, teachers, principals, superintendents, Community College personnel, College and University staff, institutional personnel, Social and Rehabilitative Services, private facility staff, and the private college sector.

An advisory council consisting of 22 members represent a broad constituency. See Appendix G for members of the Advisory Council and an agenda of the first meeting in February, 1979.

## SECTION II

## PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES

THE FIRST PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVE WAS:

1. During the first year of the program, a random sample of 50 paraprofessionals who have been trained in the program will demonstrate competency in paraprofessional skills by being rated on the average (mean level of performance) higher than 2.5 on a five-point rating scale of performance developed from the list of skills for paraprofessionals.

In order to evaluate this objective to determine whether it was met, an eleven-item rating scale was developed to be used by observers observing paraprofessionals as they worked in their respective classrooms. A total of 19 paraprofessionals were observed during the month of May, 1979. Due to the limited number of observers and the short time span to collect data, it was only possible to observe 19 paraprofessionals.

The observation rating scale is presented in Appendix H. For each skill area, the observer was to record the number of times the skill was observed during the observation period and then a rating was to be given for the skill that was observed after it was observed on at least two different occasions. A five-point rating scale was utilized for each skill area as described below:

1. Major improvement needed.
2. Some improvement needed.
3. Adequate.
4. Very good.
5. Excellent.

The summary of the tabulations of the 19 paraprofessionals that were observed appears in Table I. In the first column of this table the number of times that each skill was observed is recorded. The second column indicates how many paraprofessionals were rated in that skill. The next five columns presents the frequency of ratings for each of the various skill areas. The last two columns present the mean rating for each skill and the standard deviation of the ratings for that skill.

TABLE 1

TABULATION OF OBSERVER RATINGS OF PARAPROFESSIONALS

| Skill Area | # of Obs. | n | RESPONSE | | | | | Mean | S.D. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | | |
| 1. Working with Children. | | | | | | | | | |
| one-to-one situations | 45 | 16 | | | 1 | 11 | 4 | 4.18 | .54 |
| group activities | 32 | 15 | | | | 10 | 5 | 4.33 | .49 |
| problem solving | 34 | 13 | | | 1 | 9 | 3 | 4.15 | .55 |
| 2. Interpersonal Relations. | | | | | | | | | |
| communicating with supervising teacher | 32 | 12 | | | 1 | 9 | 2 | 4.08 | .51 |
| communicating with school staff | 33 | 13 | | | 1 | 10 | 2 | 4.08 | .49 |
| communicating with parents | 0 | 0 | | | | | | | |
| 3. Use of equipment. | 23 | 8 | | | 2 | 2 | 4 | 4.25 | .87 |
| 4. Use of teaching techniques. | | | | | | | | | |
| academics | 35 | 12 | | | | 10 | 2 | 4.17 | .39 |
| speech/language | 30 | 9 | | 1 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 4.00 | 1.00 |
| self-help skills | 26 | 11 | | | | 8 | 3 | 4.27 | .47 |
| 5. Preparation skills. | | | | | | | | | |
| classroom materials | 30 | 15 | | | | 13 | 2 | 4.13 | .37 |
| environment acts. | 46 | 19 | | | | 17 | 2 | 4.11 | .32 |

TABLE 1
(Continued)

| Skill Area | # of Obs. | n | RESPONSE 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | S.D. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 6. Assisting students. | 16 | 8 | | | | 7 | 1 | 4.13 | .35 |
| 7. A-V Skills | 0 | 0 | | | | | | | |
| 8. Managing and disciplining children. | | | | | | | | | |
| use of man. skills. | 73 | 17 | | | 2 | 11 | 4 | 4.12 | .60 |
| Use of reinforcement. | 72 | 17 | | | | 11 | 6 | 4.35 | .49 |
| 9. Participation in prof. activities. | | | | | | | | | |
| attend staff meetings | 0 | 0 | | | | | | | |
| attend staff inservice | 0 | 0 | | | | | | | |
| attend workshops | 2 | 2 | | | | | | | |
| 10. Understand Except. child. | | 19 | | | 1 | 12 | 6 | 4.26 | .56 |
| 11. Overall performance. | | 19 | | | | 12 | 7 | 4.37 | .50 |

## SECTION II
## PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVE

As indicated in the Table, all of the mean ratings were above 2.5, the criterion set for this objective. Thus, the objective was met with regard to average ratings. However, only 19 paraprofessionals were observed, not the 50 called for by the objective.

The highest ratings for the paraprofessionals were for overall performance (mean = 4.37), and the lowest mean rating was for their performance in using techniques/methods of carrying out the educational programs in the subject area of speech/language.

THE SECOND PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVE FOR THE PROJECT WAS:

2. During the first year of the program, a random sample of 50 paraprofessionals who have been trained in the program will demonstrate a positive attitude toward understanding the characteristics of the special education student they will be working with as measured by a Likert-type rating scale. Positive will be defined as a mean response higher than the mid-point rating.

In order to evaluate this objective, two instruments were used. The first is a rating scale developed by Dr. Nancy Peterson at the University of Kansas, Department of Special Education. This is a four dimensional scale with ten response items per scale each using a 6-point scale from strongly agree to strongly disagree with a provision for "No Opinion". The four scales are:

1. Attitude concerning where handicapped students are best served.
2. Attitude concerning the competency of regular classroom teachers for teaching handicapped children as well as normal children in the classroom.
3. Attitude concerning the benefits and liabilities affecting the normal child in a mainstreamed classroom.
4. Attitude concerning the benefits of handicapped children in a mainstreamed classroom.

A score of "5" always represented a strongly positive attitude, a score of "1" always represented a strongly negative attitude. Thus, any score above 3, the neutral position, would indicate a positive attitude. This was accomplished by reversing the score weights for negatively stated items. The means and standard deviations for each of the four scales is presented in Table 2.

## TABLE 2

### MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR PETERSON ATTITUDE SCALE

| Scale | Mean | S.D. |
|---|---|---|
| 1. Attitude toward where handicapped students should be best served. | 2.14 | .69 |
| 2. Attitude toward competency of regular classroom teachers. | 2.27 | .69 |
| 3. Attitude toward benefits and liabilities affecting normal children in mainstreamed classrooms. | 3.28 | .72 |
| 4. Attitude toward benefits of handicapped children in a mainstreamed classroom. | 2.50 | .83 |

As can be noted in Table 2, the only scale for which the attitude was above the neutral point was for the third scale dealing with the benefits and liabilities affecting the normal child in a mainstreamed classroom. The paraprofessionals felt that there were positive benefits for the normal child in mainstreamed classrooms. The mean responses for the other three scales was below the neutral point indicating a slightly negative attitude toward the ability of regular classrooms to serve the handicapped student, that regular classrooms do not have the facilities to provide for both handicapped and regular students at the same time, and that handicapped children could probably be best served in special rather than regular classes.

The results of this scale relate more to the opinions of the paraprofessionals regarding what they think regarding the education of handicapped students. The scale was designed to measure attitude toward mainstreaming and the benefits of mainstreaming. A measure more directly related to the objective was the Interview Form which was used for paraprofessionals, facilitators, and supervisors. Copies of each form can be found in Appendix I. As noted on these forms, there were several items which were the same and several calling for different types of information. The information specific to each interview form will be summarized first for each of the three groups: paraprofessionals, facilitators, and then supervisors. Following this, the tabulations for common items will be presented.

For the 36 paraprofessionals that were interviewed, 32 were working in self-contained rooms, 2 were working in resource rooms, I was itinerant, and 3 worked in sheltered workshops. Fourteen of those interviewed were new paraprofessionals, and 22 were experienced. The average number of years experience varied from 2 to 10, with an average number of years of 4.14 with a standard deviation of 2.65. Fourteen of those interviewed had Permit I, 2 had Permit II, and 2 had Permit III. The number of hours of inservice training that their local district/cooperative provided them during the past year varied from 1 hour to 50. The mean number of hours training was 17.48 with a standard deviation of 8.80. Other sources of training which they indicated were: State sponsored workshop, n = 19; Community College, n = 7; University, n = 11; and other, n = 12. Written in sources for other included on the job training and Title I program training.

The written responses to the question, "What are some specific areas you feel paraprofessionals need training in?", are tabulated below. The number under "f" indicated the number of paraprofessionals who indicated a specific area.

| f | Specific Area |
|---|---|
| 13 | Methods of teaching/instruction |
| 10 | Special Education, e.g., EMH, LD, ED. |
| 7 | Behavior Modification |
| 7 | Discipline |
| 3 | Graphing/charting |
| 3 | Signing |
| 3 | First Aid |
| 3 | Terminology |
| 2 | Legality |
| 2 | Programming |
| 1 | Learning Centers |
| 1 | IEP Process |

The responses to question number 6 dealing with the number of students that they have contact with each day in their roles as instructional paraprofessionals, the numbers indicated varied from 1 to 65 with a mean of 11.86 and a standard deviation of 10.65. Twenty-two of the paraprofessionals indicated that they met on a daily basis with their supervising teacher, 3 indicated that they had weekly meetings, and 7 indicated that they did not have formal meetings with their supervising teacher. Twenty-three of those interviewed indicated that they were involved with the IEP process whereas 12 indicated that they were not involved. Areas of involvement are summarized below:

informal diagnosis, n = 18
planning program with teacher, n = 22
follow-up instruction with students, n = 22
evaluation, n = 18.

The types of activites that they are responsible for are tabulated below. All 36 indicated that they were responsible for Instructional activities with the amount of time in percent varying from 20 to 100 percent with a mean of 60.69 percent and a standard deviation of 24.33. Thirty-one of the paraprofessionals indicated that they were responsible for Supervisory activities and the range of percent of their time spent for this activity varied from 5 to 50 percent, with a mean of 31.54 and a standard deviation of 20.29. Only 14 paraprofessionals indicated that they were responsible for Clerical activities, and the percent of time spent on clerical activities varied from 1 to 75 percent. The mean percent was 25.55 with a standard deviation of 22.74. Thus, most of the time is spent with instructional activities, followed by supervisory activities and then clerical activities.

The responses to the question, "What are three specific activities you do most often during the day?", are tabulated below. Again, the number under "f" indicated the number of paraprofessionals who wrote in that activity.

| f | Activity |
|---|---|
| 28 | Academics - reading, spelling, math, etc. |
| 17 | Lunch supervision, feeding |
| 16 | Prepare materials |
| 7 | Toilet training |
| 7 | Clerical |
| 6 | Individual help |
| 6 | Supervision of Learning |
| 2 | Grading |
| 2 | Cleaning |
| 2 | Personal needs of children |
| 1 | Sewing skills |

Twenty-one of those interviewed indicated that they were familiar with the Kansas State Department of Education Paraprofessional Facilitator Training Model, where as 15 indicated that they were not aware or familiar with this model.

A total of 12 facilitators were interviewed and their responses to the first four items and Item 7 appear below. With regard to the number of paraprofessionals in their district or cooperative, the responses varied from 3 to 108, with a mean of 19.18 and a standard deviation of 30.25. Thus, most of the facilitators indicated 5 which was the modal response with one indicating 108, thus the skewed distribution. The first question asked about specific training needs unique to their particular district. The following is a tabulation of their responses: Distar training, n = 2; Behavioral management training/techniques, n = 2; programs for children between SMH and trainable. The second question dealt with requests from paraprofessionals for specific help. Seven indicated that they had received such requests, whereas 5 indicated that they had not received such requests. Specific requests were for SMH techniques, general background in EMR, TMR, and LD, total special education process, IEPs, first-aid skills, ideas for music and physical education, and for specific materials and methods. Additional information that these facilitators indicated that they needed included: lists of inservice training slides or ideas, use of music with SMH, and provide the same type of assistance as given in the past. Specific training topics they would like to see presented at future workshops included: PSA information, behavioral management, charting, non-verbal communication, visual aids, new training materials, dealing with interpersonal problems, and help to show administrators the importance of inservice training for paraprofessionals. The following is a tabulation of the responses to the seventh item dealing with the administrative structures they currently have in use in the recruitment, selection, and employment of instructional paraprofessionals.

| f | Administrative Structure |
|---|---|
| 8 | Training needs assessment |
| 5 | Affirmative action policy |
| 5 | Contract |
| 3 | Competencies for employment in specific special education programs |
| 7 | Job description |
| 4 | Paraprofessional Handbook |
| 4 | Salary schedule |
| 1 | Career Ladder |
| 7 | Evaluation Procedure |

The responses of the 17 supervising teachers who were interviewed are summarized below. Fifteen of these supervisors were in self-contained types of programs and 2 of them indicated that they were in resource rooms. All of those interviewed indicated that their perception of what the role of the paraprofessional should be instructional, with 8 also indicating supervisory and 6 indicating clerical roles. Five of those interviewed were familiar with the Kansas State Department of Education Paraprofessional Facilitator Training Model, whereas 12 indicated that they were not familiar with this model.

The supervising teachers were then asked what specific areas they felt paraprofessionals needed training in. Their responses along with the frequency that each was mentioned is as follows:

| f | Specific Area |
|---|---|
| 8 | Behavioral modification |
| 6 | Special education basic courses |
| 3 | Interpersonal skills, communication |
| 2 | A-V and office equipment utilization |
| 2 | Same skills as regular teachers |
| 2 | Graphing and charting |
| 2 | Discipline |
| 1 | Instructional skills |
| 1 | Legal issues |
| 1 | Distar reading program |
| 1 | First aid |
| 1 | Confidentiality |

Fourteen of those interviewed felt that paraprofessionals could benefit from formalized college and inservice training, whereas only two felt that they would not benefit. Several indicated that such college and inservice training would have to be appropriate and related to their duties. A few indicated that inservice training would be better than formalized college courses.

## SECTION II
## PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES

When asked what activities their paraprofessionals were responsible for, their responses were tabulated into four areas: Instructional with percentage of time ranging from 20 to 90 percent with an average of 64.38 percent of the time spent in this activity; Supervising with percentages of time ranging from 5 to 60 percent with an average of 20.45 percent of the time spent in this activity; Clerical with a range of 10 to 40 percent of the time with a mean of 17.77; and Material Development with a range of from 10 to 60 percent of the time with an average for the 5 reporting this activity of 26.

Eleven of those interviewed indicated that their paraprofessionals were involved in the IEP Process, with 6 indicating that their paraprofessionals were involved with informal diagnosis, 7 with planning program with teachers, 11 with follow up instruction with students, and 7 with evaluation. Twelve of those interviewed indicated that they met formally on a daily basis with their paraprofessionals for planning, and five indicated that they did not have formal meetings.

Six supervising teachers indicated that their districts or cooperative had a formalized evaluation procedure for paraprofessionals whereas 11 indicated that no such program existed. Three of these indicated that they were in the process of developing an evaluation procedure. All of the six who indicated having such a procedure indicated that they were involved in the procedure and 2 indicated that such evaluation took place biannually and 2 indicated annually.

All of the supervising teachers indicated that their role in the training of paraprofessionals should be on-the-job training, specifically to help their paraprofessionals to work with them in their classroom, with special problems, and day-by-day activities and encounters. However, only three of those interviewed indicated that they had formalized training in how to work with paraprofessionals through inservice work provided by Dr. Bill Boomer. Fourteen indicated that they did not have such training.

When asked about what additional information they needed to work more effectively with their paraprofessionals, the following responses were given:

| f | Response |
|---|---|
| 3 | interpersonal relations skills |
| 3 | know capabilities and skills of paraprofessionals |
| 2 | changes and variety of roles of paraprofessionals |
| 2 | ideas from other areas, e.g., SMH, PSA |
| 1 | Legal limits |
| 1 | how to train paraprofessionals |
| 1 | evaluation materials |
| 1 | current do's and dont's |

For five of the items on the interview guide, the questions were the same for all three groups and the results for these three groups are summarized on the following five tables. The first table present the mean rankings of the eight competencies for each group. It should be noted in these five tables that a rank of "1" was the most important and the last rank was least important. Thus a mean value which is small would indicate that competency, skill, or duty was ranked as being most important whereas a higher mean value would indicate an area deemed less important. For the rankings of competencies for special education paraprofessionals, the means for the three groups are presented in Table 3.

## TABLE 3

## MEAN RATINGS FOR PARAPROFESSIONALS, FACILITATORS, AND SUPERVISORS FOR EIGHT COMPETENCIES FOR SPECIAL EDUCATION PARAPROFESSIONALS

| Competency | Paras. | Facils. | Supers |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Understanding Characteristics of special education students. | 1.66 | 3.58 | 2.76 |
| 2. Skills related to working with children. | 3.09 | 1.75 | 2.65 |
| 3. Interpersonal relations. | 4.63 | 3.50 | 3.94 |
| 4. Disciplinary skills. | 4.40 | 5.17 | 4.24 |
| 5. Skills in working with specific handicapped children. | 3.31 | 3.75 | 3.53 |
| 6. Subject matter skills. | 5.17 | 6.08 | 5.71 |
| 7. Organizational skills. | 5.97 | 4.75 | 5.82 |
| 8. Skills in operating A-V and office equipment. | 7.63 | 7.42 | 7.35 |

As can be noted from this table, paraprofessionals ranked "Understanding Characteristics of Special Education Students" as most important for them, whereas facilitators and supervisors ranked "Skills related to working with children" as most important. Least important competencies were those of operating A-V and office equipment. This goes along with other ratings whereby these three groups indicated that paraprofessionals are not too involved with such activities.

Table 4 shows the mean rankings for the three groups on their ranking of skills and duties of instructional paraprofessionals in order of their importance to a paraprofessional. As indicated in the table "good grooming" was ranked by all three groups as being least important whereas "Adaptability" was generally ranked high. "Tolerance" was ranked high by most of the paraprofessionals, whereas "Dependability" and "Cooperation" were ranked high by facilitators and supervisors.

The mean rankings of the skills important in the training of paraprofessionals, "Working with children" and "Understanding characteristics of special education students" were ranked as most important. Again, "operating equipment" was ranked as being least important. "Working with specific handicapps" was also ranked as being important by all groups.

Table 5 displays the mean rankings for the three groups' rankings of the educational importance of selected duties for paraprofessionals. "Educating individual children (one-to-one basis)" was thought to be the most important for all three groups. "Group educational activities" was thought to be next most important, followed by "prepare classroom materials". Least important from an educational point of view was "Working with A-V equipment", Clerical activities, housekeeping, and professional activities. Thus, the most

TABLE 4

MEAN RATINGS FOR PARAPROFESSIONALS, FACILITATORS, AND SUPERVISORS FOR CHARACTERISTICS, SKILLS, AND DUTIES OF INSTRUCTIONAL PARAPROFESSIONALS.

| Skills/Duties | Paras | Facils | Supers |
|---|---|---|---|
| Creativity | 7.91 | 7.58 | 6.47 |
| Resourcefulness | 6.09 | 4.83 | 5.00 |
| Adaptability | 3.46 | 3.33 | 3.65 |
| Tolerance | 3.89 | 5.75 | 5.59 |
| Intelligence | 6.34 | 7.17 | 7.19 |
| Versatility | 5.37 | 5.92 | 5.53 |
| Experience with Children | 5.17 | 6.83 | 6.53 |
| Energy | 6.97 | 6.67 | 8.18 |
| Dependability | 5.34 | 3.50 | 3.65 |
| Good Grooming | 9.68 | 9.58 | 10.29 |
| Cooperation | 5.77 | 4.17 | 3.06 |

TABLE 5

MEAN RANKINGS FOR PARAPROFESSIONALS, FACILITATORS, AND SUPERVISORS OF SKILLS IMPORTANT FOR TRAINING A PARAPROFESSIONAL

| Skills | Paras | Facils | Supers |
|---|---|---|---|
| Working with children. | 2.63 | 1.92 | 2.65 |
| Subject matter skills. | 4.80 | 5.42 | 5.25 |
| Understanding characteristics of special education students. | 2.14 | 3.25 | 3.24 |
| Disciplinary skills. | 4.69 | 5.33 | 4.29 |
| Interpersonal relations. | 4.83 | 4.00 | 4.47 |
| Organizational. | 5.94 | 4.58 | 5.76 |
| Operating equipment. | 7.63 | 7.67 | 6.94 |
| Working with specific handicapps. | 3.46 | 3.83 | 3.88 |

important duties for paraprofessionals were those dealing with instructional activities and least important were those dealing with clerical tasks and using audio-visual equipment. This goes along with other responses as to what paraprofessionals are actually doing in the classrooms.

The last table presents the rankings of these eleven duties on the basis of their commonness of occurrence. As with importance of these duties, educating individual children on a one-to-one basis was ranked by all three groups as being the most important followed by other duties dealing with the instructional process. Again, clerical, housekeeping, and professional activities were ranked as not being very important.

## TABLE 6

## MEAN RANKINGS FOR PARAPROFESSIONALS, FACILITATORS, AND SUPERVISORS ON EDUCATIONAL IMPORTANCE OF SELECTED DUTIES FOR PARAPROFESSIONALS

| Duty | Paras | Facils | Supers |
|---|---|---|---|
| Prepare classroom materials. | 4.50 | 4.67 | 4.41 |
| Group educational activities. | 4.28 | 3.50 | 3.53 |
| Working with A-V equipment. | 9.40 | 8.33 | 9.53 |
| Manage and disciplining children | 4.94 | 6.50 | 4.65 |
| Clerical activities | 9.16 | 8.67 | 8.47 |
| Housekeeping | 8.13 | 8.83 | 9.35 |
| Assist students with physical needs. | 4.44 | 6.00 | 5.18 |
| Teaching on one-to-one basis. | 2.94 | 2.33 | 2.41 |
| Conferring with teachers | 4.63 | 3.92 | 4.00 |
| Professional activities | 8.09 | 9.17 | 7.83 |
| Preparation of classrooms. | 5.28 | 3.92 | 6.59 |

## TABLE 7

## MEAN RANKINGS FOR PARAPROFESSIONALS,FACILITATORS, AND SUPERVISORS FOR COMMONNESS OF OCCURRENCE FOR SELECTED DUTIES FOR PARAPROFESSIONAI

| Duty | Paras. | Facils. | Supers. |
|---|---|---|---|
| Prepare classroom materials. | 4.87 | 4.83 | 3.88 |
| Group educational activities. | 4.40 | 4.25 | 4.12 |
| Working with A-V equipment. | 9.53 | 8.58 | 9.47 |
| Manage and discipline children | 5.10 | 5.83 | 4.24 |
| Clerical activities | 7.91 | 7.75 | 7.76 |
| Housekeeping | 7.47 | 6.92 | 8.65 |
| Assist students with physical needs. | 4.63 | 7.00 | 5.35 |
| Teaching on one-to-one basis | 3.07 | 2.33 | 2.50 |
| Conferring with teachers | 4.73 | 4.33 | 4.59 |
| Professional activities | 8.17 | 9.83 | 8.59 |
| Preparation of classrooms | 6.10 | 4.33 | 6.71 |

THE THIRD PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVE FOR THE PROJECT WAS:

> 3. During the first year of the program, the materials and media that have been developed and field-tested will be rated as appropriate for training paraprofessionals by one-half of the teachers and supervisors participating in the program model. The rating scale to be developed will utilize either a Likert-type scale or a semantic differential type of scale.

The rating scales to field test the media that have been developed during the course of the first year and presented to the facilitators at the winter meeting in February, 1979. The scales were critiqued by the facilitators and final drafts were adopted to be used on a pilot basis in the spring, 1979.

The rating scales are as follows: one scale to be completed by the facilitator or trainer for the teacher training program; one general scale for use by anyone other than a specific facilitator or trainer after viewing any media; one scale to be completed by paraprofessionals; one scale to be used by teachers after having viewed the slide-tape on teachers and paraprofessionals, and one scale for use by facilitators or trainers in general. Each of the rating scales is included in Appendix J of this document. A summation of the pilot test of the rating scales are presented in Appendix K. The rating scales will be used extensively during the second year of the training project.

## SECTION III

## FORMATIVE EVALUATIONS OF WORKSHOPS

# EVALUATION REPORT FOR

# PARA-PROFESSIONAL IN-SERVICE TRAINING WORKSHOP

September, 21-23,1978

by

Larry L. Havlicek

This is a report of the post-session evaluations used to provide formative feedback information for the three-day workshop conducted in Topeka on September 21, 22, and 23, 1978. There were three separate sessions for three different groups of participants. The evaluations were done at the end of each session using a specially developed post-session evaluation form for each group of participants.

The rating scale that was used for each evaluation asked each participant to rate each aspect of the workshop on a five-point Likert type of scale. For each aspect, the participants were asked to respond to the following four items:

a. Appropriateness of training.

b. Effectiveness of training.

c. Usefulness of training.

d. My understanding of this objective.

For these items, the higher the rating, i.e., a rating of 4 or 5, the higher the degree of appropriateness, effectiveness, etc. In addition to having the participants rate each aspect of the workshop, there were four general questions about the entire workshop, and for the paraprofessionals, a similar scale for each of the mini-workshops that each participant attended. A copy of each of the evaluation forms used is included in the appendix of this report.

The responses of the participants were keypunched and the analyses were done on the computer using the FREQUENCIES program in the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). The results of these analyses are presented in the following report. The results will be presented separately for each group of participants.

## Workshop for Deans of Instruction and Directors of Education From Community Colleges.

There were eight deans and/or directors who completed the post-session evaluation form. The tabulation of the responses for these eight participants are presented in Table 1 which also includes the mean ratings for each item. The "0" category was to be used for "not applicable" or "did not attend". These responses were not used to compute the mean ratings.

As indicated in Table 1, most of the responses were ratings of "4" or "3" for most items, indicating a generally high rating for most items. There were a few very high ratings, and generally these outnumbered the low ratings. Thus, the mean ratings were generally above the middle point in the five-point rating scale, indicating that the participants tended to rate the items for each session fairly high. The means varied from a low of 3.25 for the ratings of Effectiveness of the session on the background of the facilitators model and network and the Usefulness of the session on framework for working with local school districts, to a high of 3.38 for Appropriateness of Kansas statutes and rules and for My understanding of the competencies for special education paraprofessionals, and the highest mean rating of 4.14 for Usefulness of the definition of the special education paraprofessional and an overview of the roles and responsibilities of the paraprofessional as a member of the educational team. Evidently, the participants felt that this was the most useful concept that they gained from this workshop.

Although the ratings were fairly close with regard to the mean ratings, there were some trends that can be noted. Generally the participants felt that their understanding of the concepts and objectives was fairly high, varying from a mean rating of 3.88 for Kansas statutes and rules and Competencies for special education paraprofessionals, to a low of 3.25 for Background on facilitators model and network and Framework for working with local school districts. The two sessions that the participants felt were the most appropriate and useful were the session on Kansas statutes and rules and Definition of special education paraprofessionals.

The participants were also given a chance to write in comments, and to indicate whether or not they felt that additional training or help would be useful to them in their planning and developing programs for special education paraprofessionals. Seven of the participants indicated that they felt that such training would be helpful, and only 1 indicated that he was not sure. Thus, it appears that additional training and help would be beneficial to these deans and directors of education.

Since there were only a few written-in comments concerning the additional training that they indicated they wanted, the responses will be presented below as they were written:

## TABLE 1

## FREQUENCIES OF RATINGS AND MEAN RATINGS FOR WORKSHOP FOR DEANS OF INSTRUCTION AND DIRECTORS OF EDUCATION

| Session and Item | Ratings | | | | | | Mean |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |
| 1. Background on Facilitators Model and Network. | | | | | | | |
| A. Appropriateness of Training | | | | 4 | 4 | | 3.50 |
| B. Effectiveness of Training | | | 1 | 4 | 3 | | 3.25 |
| C. Usefulness of Training | | | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 3.75 |
| D. My understanding of this objective. | | | | 4 | 4 | | 3.50 |
| 2. Kansas statutes & rules. | | | | | | | |
| A. Appropriateness | | | 1 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 3.88 |
| B. Effectiveness | | | 2 | | 5 | 1 | 3.63 |
| C. Usefulness | | | | 2 | 4 | 2 | 3.75 |
| D. My understanding | | | 1 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 3.88 |
| 3. Definition of Spec. Educ. paraprofessional. | | | | | | | |
| A. Appropriateness | 1 | | | 2 | 4 | 1 | 3.86 |
| B. Effectiveness | 1 | 1 | 1 | | 4 | 1 | 3.43 |
| C. Usefulness | 1 | | | 1 | 4 | 2 | 4.14 |
| D. My understanding | 1 | | | 2 | 4 | 1 | 3.86 |
| 4. Competencies for Spec. Educ. paraprofessionals. | | | | | | | |
| A. Appropriateness | | | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3.63 |
| B. Effectiveness | | | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3.50 |
| C. Usefulness | | | | 4 | 2 | 2 | 3.75 |
| D. My understanding | | | 1 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 3.88 |

Table 1
(Continued)

| Session and Item | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 5. Framework for working with local school districts. | | | | | | | |
| A. Appropriateness | 4 | | | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3.75 |
| B. Effectiveness | 4 | | | 2 | 2 | | 3.50 |
| C. Usefulness | 4 | | | 3 | 1 | | 3.25 |
| D. My understanding. | 4 | | | 2 | 2 | | 3.50 |

The first slide-tape was excellent. Can we buy a copy? Should indicate how this can relate to severaly handicapped students -- that's probably where paraprofessionals are needed the most. Thanks for the entire packet of materials.

Developing appropriate and specific courses for the Associate Degree program.

Help with courses to offer, competencies expected, staff needed, and needs study.

Need to see examples of courses of study and examples of teacher qualifications necessary to teach aides.

Help with overall setting up of training programs.

Use of the session could have focused on working with local school districts as per memo received 9/21, not selling the idea of paraprofessionals. My main objective for the day was to learn of contact persons, avenues available to college and district needs, rather than forms and newsletters.

## Workshop for "New" Paraprofessional Facilitators

There were 18 participants who completed the post-session evaluation form for the workshop for new paraprofessional facilitators. The tabulations of the ratings and the mean ratings for each item are presented in Table 2. The format of the evaluation rating form followed that of the previous workshop, using the same type of five-point Likert type scale.

As indicated by the tabulation of ratings in Table 2, the majority of the ratings were high, i.e., ratings of 4 and 5. This is reflected in the mean ratings which were consistently around 4 or higher. The mean ratings varied from a low of 3.94 for appropriateness of and usefulness of the session on the background on the facilitators model and statewide network, to a high of 4.61 for the ratings for the session on definition of, roles of, and responsibilities of the special education paraprofessional. Evidently, the participants felt that this session was the most important for them.

The overall ratings for the entire workshop were quite high, with mean ratings of 4.4 for usefulness of total workshop, what was accomplished during the workshop, and for the overal structure and tasks of the workshop. Thus, it appears that this workshop was well received and that the participants felt that they gained much from attending this workshop.

The last question asked the participants if they felt that additional training would be helpful to them in their planning and developing programs for special education paraprofessionals. Fourteen of the 18 participants responded "Yes", only two responded "No", and two did not check either "yes" or "no". Thus, the

## TABLE 2

## FREQUENCIES OF RATINGS AND MEAN RATINGS FOR WORKSHOP FOR NEW PARAPROFESSIONAL FACILITATORS

| Session and Item | Ratings 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Introduction to Kansas Statutes, rules, etc. | | | | | | | |
| A. Appropriateness | | | | 3 | 10 | 5 | 4.11 |
| B. Effectiveness | | | | 4 | 10 | 4 | 4.00 |
| C. Usefulness | | | | 3 | 12 | 3 | 4.00 |
| D. My understanding | | | | 2 | 11 | 5 | 4.17 |
| 2. Definitions of, roles, of paraprofessionals | | | | | | | |
| A. Appropriateness | | | | 1 | 5 | 12 | 4.61 |
| B. Effectiveness | | | | 1 | 7 | 10 | 4.50 |
| C. Usefulness | | | | | 7 | 11 | 4.61 |
| D. My understanding | | | | | 7 | 11 | 4.61 |
| 3. Background of Model | | | | | | | |
| A. Appropriateness | | | 1 | 3 | 10 | 4 | 3.94 |
| B. Effectiveness | | | | 4 | 10 | 4 | 4.00 |
| C. Usefulness | | | | 5 | 9 | 4 | 3.94 |
| D. My understanding | | | | 3 | 9 | 6 | 4.17 |
| 4. Usefulness of Total Workshop 1 | | | | 1 | 8 | 8 | 4.41 |
| 5. Appropriateness of Workshop | | | | 2 | 9 | 7 | 4.28 |
| 6. Accomplished during workshop | | | | | 10 | 8 | 4.44 |
| 7. Workshop structure and tasks | | | | 2 | 6 | 10 | 4.44 |

majority of the participants felt that such training or help was needed. The participants were asked to write in what kind of additional training or help that they wanted. Their written responses are summarized below:

| f | Response |
|---|---|
| 5 | Specific materials for conducting a training program or workshop. |
| 4 | Determining inservice needs, ideas and resources. |
| 2 | More group involvement and discussion during workshop. |
| 1 | Need specific workshop models. |
| 1 | Have workshop during first week of school. |
| 1 | Use role-playing, group activities in workshop. |
| 1 | Want list of recommended books and pamphlets. |
| 1 | Communicating with paraprofessionals. |
| 1 | Application for funding. |
| 1 | Great to be part of the program. |

Thus, five participants indicated that they wanted specific materials for conducting a training program, four participants wanted help with determining inservice needs/ideas, and two participants wanted more group involvement and discussion during the workshop.

The written in responses were consistent with the other ratings of the workshop, i.e., the session of the workshop that received the highest ratings was the session on roles and responsibilities of the special education paraprofessional. The responses listed above indicated that this is also where the participants would like additional information, i.e., in working with and training special education paraprofessionals.

Topeka Regional Paraprofessional Workshop

There were 111 paraprofessionals who completed the post-session evaluation rating form for the Topeka Regional Paraprofessional workshop held on Saturday, September 23, 1978. The evaluation form was similar to the other forms used with the addition that there were responses for each of the three mini-workshops that each participant could attend. This section of the evaluation report will present the results for the main parts of the workshop, and then will present the results for each of the five mini-workshops that were held.

The frequencies of ratings and mean ratings for this workshop are presented in Table 3. As with the previous two tables, the responses indicated that all aspects of the workshop were rated high. Nearly all of the mean ratings were above 4.0, with only two ratings very slightly below that, at 3.98. The highest ratings were for the first session of the workshop, that dealing with increasing awareness of the professionalism of the paraprofessional in the total educational system. The participants felt that this was the most appropriate, most effective, and most useful of the workshop. The legal implications of their role was rated next highest, and the overview of P.L. 94-142 and 504 regulations was rated next. The latter session was rated "low" by a number of the participants. However, generally, the ratings were high indicating that most of the sessions were appropriate, effectively presented, would be useful, and that they felt that their understanding of the objectives was fairly high.

## TABLE 3

## FREQUENCIES OF RATINGS AND MEAN RATINGS FOR WORKSHOP

## TOPEKA REGIONAL PARAPROFESSIONAL WORKSHOP

| Session and Item | Ratings | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean |
| 1. Increasing awareness | | | | | | | |
| A. Appropriateness | 7 | | 1 | 10 | 23 | 70 | 4.56 |
| B. Effectiveness | 6 | | | 13 | 34 | 58 | 4.43 |
| C. Usefulness | 7 | | | 10 | 28 | 66 | 4.54 |
| D. My understanding | 2 | | | 7 | 27 | 75 | 4.62 |
| 2. Overview of regulations | | | | | | | |
| A. Appropriateness | 3 | 4 | 5 | 15 | 39 | 45 | 4.07 |
| B. Effectiveness | 5 | 3 | 3 | 26 | 35 | 39 | 3.98 |
| C. Usefulness | 5 | 3 | 4 | 22 | 40 | 37 | 3.98 |
| D. My understanding | 1 | 1 | 3 | 26 | 35 | 45 | 4.09 |
| 3. Legal implications | | | | | | | |
| A. Appropriateness | 9 | | 3 | 9 | 37 | 53 | 4.37 |
| B. Effectiveness | 9 | 1 | 2 | 17 | 38 | 44 | 4.20 |
| C. Usefulness | 10 | | 5 | 13 | 37 | 46 | 4.23 |
| D. My understanding | 8 | | 3 | 17 | 36 | 47 | 4.23 |
| 7. Usefulness of total workshop | 11 | 1 | 1 | 10 | 33 | 55 | 4.40 |
| 8. Appropriateness of Total Workshop | 13 | 1 | 6 | 15 | 40 | 36 | 4.06 |
| 9. Rate total workshop | 13 | | | 17 | 40 | 41 | 4.25 |
| 10. Rate structure and tasks of workshop | 11 | | | 7 | 36 | 57 | 4.50 |

The frequencies of ratings and mean ratings for the mini-workshops are presented in Table 4. The mini-workshops for medical/first-aide, and for behavior modification were rated the highest, followed by the miniworkshop for characteristics of exceptional children, then methods and materials, and the mini-workshop for paraprofessionals in institutional settings. From the point of view of attendance, the behavior modification mini-workshop was attended by the largest number of participants, followed by an equal number attending the characteristics of exceptional children workshop and the methods and materials workshop. Only 12 attended the paraprofessionals in institutional settings mini-workshop.

In addition to the ratings, the participants were asked to provide suggestions that they might have for future meetings. The responses in order of frequency are presented below:

| f | Response |
|---|---|
| 18 | Need more time in workshops, too short. |
| 18 | Need more time to interact/share ideas, to discuss ideas in workshop. |
| 12 | Leadership and speakers for workshop were great. |
| 7 | More concepts and ideas for TMH. |
| 6 | Too much on legal aspects - was repetitive. |
| 5 | Need more practical help, less theory. |
| 5 | Suggest workshop for both teachers and their paraprofessionals -- to discuss and share problems. |
| 5 | Need more workshops like this, was great. |
| 5 | Physical arrangement could have been better. |
| 3 | Need more on special teaching methods for LD, EMH. |
| 3 | Need more specific teaching ideas for reading, math, etc. |

TABLE 4

FREQUENCIES OF RATINGS AND MEAN RATINGS FOR MINIWORKSHOPS

| Workshop and Items | N | Ratings 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Medical and First Aide | | | | | | | |
| A. Appropriateness | 37 | | | 3 | 5 | 29 | 4.70 |
| B. Effectiveness | 36 | | 2 | 6 | 6 | 22 | 4.33 |
| C. Usefulness | 36 | | 1 | 4 | 8 | 23 | 4.47 |
| D. My understanding | 36 | | 1 | 2 | 13 | 20 | 4.44 |
| Behavior Modification | | | | | | | |
| A. Appropriateness | 96 | | | 4 | 21 | 71 | 4.70 |
| B. Effectiveness | 97 | | 2 | 12 | 28 | 55 | 4.40 |
| C. Usefulness | 96 | | 3 | 9 | 26 | 58 | 4.45 |
| D. My understanding | 99 | | | 4 | 29 | 66 | 4.63 |
| Characteristics of Exceptional Children | | | | | | | |
| A. Appropriateness | 76 | | | 4 | 18 | 54 | 4.66 |
| B. Effectiveness | 76 | 1 | | 14 | 20 | 41 | 4.32 |
| C. Usefulness | 76 | 1 | 4 | 10 | 18 | 43 | 4.29 |
| D. My understanding | 77 | | | 8 | 18 | 51 | 4.56 |
| Paraprofessionals in Institutional Settings | | | | | | | |
| A. Appropriateness | 11 | | | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4.00 |
| B. Effectiveness | 10 | | 1 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 3.50 |
| C. Usefulness | 10 | | | 5 | 2 | 3 | 3.80 |
| D. My understanding | 12 | | | 3 | 5 | 4 | 4.08 |
| Methods and Materials | | | | | | | |
| A. Appropriateness | 76 | 2 | 2 | 10 | 17 | 45 | 4.33 |
| B. Effectiveness | 75 | 2 | 5 | 20 | 17 | 31 | 3.93 |
| C. Usefulness | 75 | 2 | 6 | 15 | 19 | 33 | 4.00 |
| D. My understanding | 76 | 1 | 5 | 16 | 16 | 38 | 4.12 |

| | |
|---|---|
| 2 | Group paraprofessionals in related areas together. |
| 2 | Procedures were good. |
| 1 | Leadership for workshop was good. |
| 1 | Have different materials for new paraprofessionals. |
| 1 | Need more emphasis on gifted programs. |
| 1 | Need metric workshop. |

## Summary

From the responses of the participants to the three post-session evaluation forms, it appears that the participants for all three workshops felt that the workshop sessions were appropriate, effectively presented, useful to the participants, and that their understanding of the objectives was high. Nearly all of the responses were at the high end of the five-point Likert scale used to measure the participants' reaction to the sessions, and all mean ratings were above 3.00, the center point or neutral point of the rating scales. In addition to the ratings, the participants provided many suggestions for future workshops and how these workshops might be planned so that they would be as effective or more effective than the present workshops.

# EVALUATION REPORT FOR
# WICHITA REGIONAL PARAPROFESSIONAL WORKSHOP

October 30,1978

by

Larry L. Havlicek

This report of the Wichita Regional Paraprofessional Workshop will follow the same format as the evaluation report for the Hays and Dodge City workshop. The same instrument was used for the post-session formative evaluation, and the same types of analyses were done.

The rating scale that was used asked each participant to rate each aspect of the workshop on a five-point Likert scale. For each aspect, the participants were asked to respond to the following four items:

Appropriateness of the training.

Effectiveness of the training.

Usefulness of the concepts/topics covered.

Each participants understanding of the concepts/topics covered.
A rating of 5 indicated a high degree of appropriateness, usefulness, effectiveness, and understanding, whereas a rating of 1 indicated a low level of the same items. The results were tabulated by the computer using the FREQUENCIES program in the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences. The results are summarized by presenting the distribution of responses to each item as well as the mean ratings for each item.

Two-hundred and five participants completed and returned the post-session evaluation form. The frequencies of responses are presented in Tables 1 and 2 for these 205 participants.

Table 1 presents the tabulations for the first three items on the evaluation form and the last four items dealing with the total workshop as a unit. As with other paraprofessional workshop evaluations, the ratings were consistently high for all sessions/objectives and items. The lowest mean rating was for 3.71 for the effectiveness of the presentation on P.L. 94-142 and the 504 regulations, followed by the next lowest rating for the usefulness of this session. Some of the written in comments concerning this session were that this was a duplication of what the participants had at other meetings. Thus, possibly the lower ratings for this session might be due to the fact that the participants felt that there was duplication of information that they had obtained from other meetings.

Relatively high ratings were given to the usefulness and the participants' understanding of the session on increasing awareness of the professionalism of the paraprofessional in the total educational system. However, these ratings were only slightly higher than most of the other ratings. The ratings only varied from a low of 3.71 to a high of 4.19. Thus, all aspects of the workshop were consistently rated on the high side of the rating scale. As can be seen from Table 1, most of the responses to the items were 3, 4, or 5, with a few ones and twos. Thus, most of the participants rated the various aspects of the workshop fairly high.

TABLE 1

FREQUENCIES OF RATINGS AND MEAN RATINGS FOR WICHITA REGIONAL PARAPROFESSIONAL WORKSHOP

| Session and Item | Ratings | | | | | | Mean |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |
| 1. Increasing awareness of professionalism. | | | | | | | |
| A. Appropriateness | 8 | 6 | 7 | 40 | 74 | 70 | 3.99 |
| B. Effectiveness | 11 | 7 | 6 | 53 | 67 | 61 | 3.87 |
| C. Usefulness | 10 | 6 | 5 | 39 | 71 | 74 | 4.04 |
| D. My understanding | 12 | 3 | 2 | 31 | 76 | 81 | 4.19 |
| 2. Overview of laws. | | | | | | | |
| A. Appropriateness | 6 | 6 | 10 | 46 | 69 | 68 | 3.92 |
| B. Effectiveness | 9 | 7 | 15 | 56 | 67 | 51 | 3.71 |
| C. Usefulness | 10 | 10 | 14 | 49 | 67 | 55 | 3.73 |
| D. My understanding | 8 | 4 | 10 | 54 | 61 | 68 | 3.91 |
| 3. Legal implications. | | | | | | | |
| A. Appropriateness | 11 | 7 | 9 | 40 | 60 | 78 | 4.00 |
| B. Effectiveness | 15 | 6 | 9 | 51 | 69 | 55 | 3.83 |
| C. Usefulness | 16 | 6 | 14 | 43 | 64 | 62 | 3.86 |
| D. My understanding | 15 | 6 | 14 | 49 | 58 | 63 | 3.83 |
| 7. Total workshop usefulness. | 8 | 5 | 6 | 36 | 56 | 94 | 4.16 |
| 8. Total workshop appropriate. | 7 | 8 | 10 | 46 | 62 | 72 | 3.91 |
| 9. Accomplished at workshop. | 9 | 5 | 11 | 45 | 72 | 63 | 3.90 |
| 10. Workshop structure. | 7 | 3 | 12 | 43 | 67 | 73 | 3.99 |

The tabulations of the responses of the participants' ratings of the mini-workshops are presented in Table 2. The number of participants rating each workshop is given under N, and the mean rating is indicated under the column headed "Mean". As indicated in the table, the mean ratings varied from a low of 2.40 for the mini-workshop on paraprofessionals in institutional settings to a high of 4.58 for the mini-workshop on learning modes. Thus, it appears that the participants generally rated the latter mini-workshop very high with regard to appropriateness, effectiveness, usefulness, and understanding, and the mini-workshop on paraprofessionals in institutional settings as quite low. In interpreting the ratings, one should keep in mind the number of participants who completed rating forms for each mini-workshop. In addition to the ratings, some participants made comments by their ratings on the evaluation form. These will be summarized for each of the mini-workshops.

Behavior Modification mini-workshop:

| f | Responses |
|---|---|
| 7 | Not enough time, got a late start. |
| 3 | Could not hear tape. |
| 2 | Didn't get packet of materials. |
| 2 | Not for SMH. |
| 2 | Too many people, could not see or hear. |
| 1 | Would like to hear this woman as a speaker. |

Characteristics of Exceptional Children

| | |
|---|---|
| 1 | Need more time. |

## TABLE 2

## FREQUENCIES OF RATINGS AND MEAN RATINGS FOR MINI-WORKSHOPS

| Mini-workshop and Items | N | Ratings | | | | | Mean |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |
| Behavior Modification | | | | | | | |
| A. Appropriateness | 169 | 7 | 6 | 23 | 45 | 88 | 4.19 |
| B. Effectiveness | 168 | 12 | 16 | 40 | 48 | 52 | 3.67 |
| C. Usefulness | 167 | 11 | 14 | 33 | 44 | 65 | 3.83 |
| D. My understanding | 166 | 6 | 13 | 27 | 50 | 70 | 3.99 |
| Characteristics of Exc. Child. | | | | | | | |
| A. Appropriateness | 100 | 7 | 6 | 17 | 36 | 34 | 3.84 |
| B. Effectiveness | 102 | 8 | 13 | 25 | 34 | 22 | 3.48 |
| C. Usefulness | 100 | 8 | 12 | 30 | 25 | 25 | 3.47 |
| D. My understanding | 102 | 2 | 9 | 22 | 28 | 41 | 3.95 |
| First Aid/Medical. | | | | | | | |
| A. Appropriateness | 28 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 7 | 16 | 4.29 |
| B. Effectiveness | 28 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 15 | 4.11 |
| C. Usefulness | 28 | | | 4 | 6 | 18 | 4.50 |
| D. My understanding | 28 | | 1 | 3 | 6 | 18 | 4.46 |
| Learning Modes. | | | | | | | |
| A. Appropriateness | 151 | 2 | 2 | 9 | 32 | 106 | 4.58 |
| B. Effectiveness | 150 | 2 | 1 | 14 | 30 | 103 | 4.54 |
| C. Usefulness | 148 | 2 | 2 | 16 | 23 | 105 | 4.53 |
| D. My understanding | 149 | 1 | 2 | 14 | 31 | 101 | 4.54 |
| Methods and Materials. | | | | | | | |
| A. Appropriateness | 105 | 8 | 9 | 17 | 26 | 45 | 3.87 |
| B. Effectiveness | 104 | 9 | 13 | 31 | 26 | 25 | 3.43 |
| C. Usefulness | 104 | 17 | 6 | 30 | 22 | 29 | 3.39 |
| D. My understanding | 105 | 6 | 7 | 22 | 31 | 39 | 3.86 |
| Paras in Institutional Settings. | | | | | | | |
| A. Appropriateness | 20 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 7 | 3.15 |
| B. Effectiveness | 20 | 7 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 2.70 |
| C. Usefulness | 20 | 9 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 2.40 |
| D. My understanding | 20 | 6 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 7 | 3.15 |

Learning Modes Mini-workshop

| f | Responses |
|---|---|
| 1 | Very good. |
| 1 | Suprise element good. |

Methods and Materials Mini-workshop.

| | |
|---|---|
| 3 | Hard to hear. |
| 3 | Not enough time. |
| 1 | Did not get to my aged students. |
| 1 | Too many people in group. |
| 1 | Did not gething anything out of it. |

Other suggestions and comments written-in for the entire workshop included the following comments. Again, the number of participants mentioning each suggestion is given under the f column.

| f | Responses |
|---|---|
| 38 | Have more time for mini-workshops, time was too short. |
| 37 | Have separate rooms for workshops, could not hear and too much confusion to have more than one mini-workshop in same room. |
| 16 | Need more workshops for SMH. |
| 14 | Have more sessions -- too crowded and groups too large. |
| 10 | Excellent workshop - very good. |
| 7 | Need more information on PSA students, especially at secondary level. |
| 7 | Less on P.L. 94-142 and legal implications - repetition of other meetings. |
| 7 | Ran out of handouts and materials. |
| 7 | Need non-smoking areas. |

| f | Responses |
|---|---|
| 5 | Need more specific information - much of the information was too general. |
| 4 | Need to discuss how to handle discipline problems. |
| 4 | Tried to cover too many areas in the workshop. |
| 4 | Dr. Boomer was very good. |
| 3 | Need to consider all grade levels, e.g., jr. hi. |
| 3 | Need more on staff relations: teacher-para-principal relationships. |
| 3 | Too much duplication from previous meetings and workshops. |
| 3 | Send out more information on content before workshop. |
| 3 | Have on a Saturday so more can attend. |
| 2 | Use more case studies. |
| 2 | Divide into two groups: elementary and secondary levels. |
| 1 | More on Behaviour Modification. |
| 1 | Have smaller groups for mini-workshops. |
| 1 | Show facilitator model film to classroom teachers. |

## Summary

Generally the paraprofessionals attending the Wichita Regional Paraprofessional Workshop gave high ratings to nearly all aspects of the workshop. The only exception was for the mini-workshop on paraprofessionals in institutional settings, which was rated much lower than the other mini-workshops. Otherwise, the ratings were consistently high indicating that the participants felt that the workshop was conducted well, covered appropriate and useful topics, and that they understood the concepts and ideas presented.

Written-in suggestions and comments indicated that the participants wanted more time for the mini-workshops, and suggested that these be held in separate rooms so that they could hear better and to reduce the confusion of having more than one meeting in the same room. Several of the comments indicated that the participants wanted more of these workshops, which could be interpreted that they found the workshop to be useful to them and beneficial as a paraprofessional.

# EVALUATION REPORT FOR

# PARA-PROFESSIONAL IN-SERVICE TRAINING WORKSHOP

October, 1978

by

Larry L. Havlicek

This is a report of the post-session evaluations used to provide formative feedback information for the regional para-professional workshops at Hays and Dodge City conducted during the Month of October, 1978. The evaluations were done at the end of each workshop using a specially developed post-session evaluation form which is attached to this report. The results will be presented for various sub-groups attending these workshops as well as for all participants combined.

The rating scale that was used for each evaluation asked each participant to rate each aspect of the workshop on a five-point Likert type of scale. For each aspect, the participants were asked to respond to the following four items:

Appropriateness of the training.

Effectiveness of the training.

Usefulness of the concepts/topics covered.

My understanding of the concepts/topics covered.

For each of these items, the higher the rating, i.e., a four or a five rating, would indicate a high degree of appropriateness, effectiveness, usefulness, or understanding. A low rating, would indicate a low degree of the above items. The same scale was used to rate each session as well as the total workshop as a unit.

The responses of the participants were keypunched into IBM cards and the analyses were done on the computer using the FREQUENCIES program in the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences. The results will be presented separately for each group as well as for all participants at both workshops. In addition to the tabulations of the responses, mean ratings were computed and are presented in the tables.

There were a total of 127 participants who completed the post-session evaluation form. As indicated in Tables 2 and 3, there were 65 forms completed after the Hays workshop, and 62 forms completed after the Dodge City workshop. The participants for the Dodge City workshop were further categorized into those from Dodge City and those from SCK-SEC. These tabulations are presented in Tables 4 and 5.

The tabulations of the responses for all participants are presented in Table 1. As indicated in this table, the majority of the ratings were 3, 4, or 5, with relatively few ratings of 1 or 2. Thus, the majority of the participants expressed a positive or high rating for most aspects of the workshop. The ratings were very consistent for all aspects of the workshop, as can be denoted from an inspection of the mean ratings. These varied from a low of 3.89 to a high of 4.34, the rating for the usefulness of the total workshop. Evidently the participants felt that the workshops as a unit were very useful to them. The range of ratings which only varied .45 of a point from the lowest mean rating to the highest mean rating indicated a very consistent

## TABLE 1

## FREQUENCIES OF RATINGS AND MEAN RATINGS FOR ALL PARTICIPANTS

N = 127

| Session and Item | Ratings | | | | | | Mean |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |
| 1. Increasing awareness of professionalism. | | | | | | | |
| A. Appropriateness | 3 | 4 | 4 | 18 | 35 | 63 | 4.20 |
| B. Effectiveness | 4 | 1 | 5 | 29 | 36 | 52 | 4.08 |
| C. Usefulness | 4 | 4 | 6 | 25 | 32 | 56 | 4.06 |
| D. My understanding | 6 | 2 | 1 | 24 | 43 | 51 | 4.16 |
| 2. Overview of laws. | | | | | | | |
| A. Appropriateness | 4 | | 6 | 31 | 45 | 41 | 3.98 |
| B. Effectiveness | 5 | | 8 | 37 | 37 | 40 | 3.89 |
| C. Usefulness | 5 | | 7 | 34 | 37 | 44 | 3.97 |
| D. My understanding | 6 | 1 | 7 | 32 | 45 | 36 | 3.89 |
| 3. Legal implications | | | | | | | |
| A. Appropriateness | 6 | 2 | 5 | 24 | 32 | 58 | 4.15 |
| B. Effectiveness | 7 | 2 | 2 | 32 | 34 | 50 | 4.07 |
| C. Usefulness | 5 | 3 | 4 | 21 | 39 | 55 | 4.14 |
| D. My understanding | 7 | 1 | 3 | 33 | 38 | 45 | 4.03 |
| 7. Total workshop usefulness | 7 | | 2 | 16 | 41 | 61 | 4.34 |
| 8. Total workshop appropriate | 8 | 3 | 2 | 26 | 38 | 50 | 4.09 |
| 9. Accomplished at workshop | 7 | 1 | 1 | 25 | 52 | 41 | 4.09 |
| 10. Workshop structure | 6 | | 3 | 23 | 39 | 56 | 4.22 |

fairly high regard for the workshops, and this was consistent for all aspects of the workshop. Thus, the workshops can be considered as being quite successful in the appropriateness, effectiveness, and usefulness of the concepts covered, as well as providing a high level of understanding of the concepts.

The patterns of responses for the two workshops were very consistent. Comparing the responses and the mean ratings for all participants from Hays (Table 2) with all participants from Dodge City (Table 3), reveals that they are very similar. Taking into consideration the standard error of each mean, there were no significant differences among the mean ratings for these two workshops. Thus, the ratings for both groups were similar.

The same types of comparisons were made for the mean ratings for the workshop at Dodge City. The participants at this workshop were further classified as those from SCK-SEC and those not from SCK-SEC. The results are presented in Tables 4 and 5, and indicate that the responses are very similar. Applying the z ratio for comparing the differences of mean ratings using the standard error of each mean, no significant differences were found at the .05 level of significance. Thus, the mean ratings for these two sub-groups can be considered equivalent.

Generally, the highest ratings were for the usefulness of the total workshop. Thus, the participants felt that the workshop was useful to them as a paraprofessional. As will be seen from other ratings, the usefulness of the workshop was consistently rated higher than other aspects.

## TABLE 2

## FREQUENCIES OF RATINGS AND MEAN RATINGS FOR PARTICIPANTS FROM HAYS

N = 65

| Session and Item | Ratings 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Increasing awareness of professionalism. | | | | | | | |
| A. Appropriateness | 2 | 4 | 3 | 10 | 16 | 30 | 4.03 |
| B. Effectiveness | 3 | 1 | 4 | 15 | 20 | 22 | 3.94 |
| C. Usefulness | 3 | 3 | 3 | 11 | 18 | 27 | 4.02 |
| D. My understanding | 4 | 1 | 1 | 12 | 26 | 21 | 4.07 |
| 2. Overview of laws. | | | | | | | |
| A. Appropriateness | 3 | | 4 | 17 | 19 | 22 | 3.95 |
| B. Effectiveness | 4 | | 5 | 19 | 17 | 20 | 3.85 |
| C. Usefulness | 4 | | 4 | 12 | 20 | 25 | 4.08 |
| D. My understanding | 4 | | 6 | 13 | 24 | 18 | 3.89 |
| 3. Legal implications. | | | | | | | |
| A. Appropriateness | 2 | 1 | 2 | 10 | 21 | 29 | 4.19 |
| B. Effectiveness | 3 | 1 | 1 | 13 | 25 | 22 | 4.07 |
| C. Usefulness | 2 | 1 | 2 | 9 | 21 | 30 | 4.22 |
| D. My understanding | 3 | | 1 | 15 | 26 | 20 | 4.05 |
| 7. Total workshop usefulness | 2 | | 1 | 8 | 25 | 29 | 4.30 |
| 8. Total workshop appropriate | 2 | 1 | 2 | 16 | 19 | 25 | 4.03 |
| 9. Accomplished at workshop | 2 | 1 | | 11 | 23 | 23 | 4.14 |
| 10. Workshop structure | 1 | | 3 | 14 | 16 | 31 | 4.17 |

## TABLE 3

## FREQUENCIES OF RATINGS AND MEAN RATINGS FOR ALL DODGE CITY PARTICIPANTS

N = 62

| Session and Item | Ratings | | | | | | Mean |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |
| 1. Increasing awareness of professionalism. | | | | | | | |
| A. Appropriateness | 1 | | 1 | 8 | 19 | 33 | 4.38 |
| B. Effectiveness | 1 | | 1 | 14 | 16 | 30 | 4.23 |
| C. Usefulness | 1 | 1 | 3 | 14 | 14 | 29 | 4.10 |
| D. My understanding | 2 | 1 | | 12 | 17 | 30 | 4.25 |
| 2. Overview of laws. | | | | | | | |
| A. Appropriateness | 1 | | 2 | 14 | 26 | 19 | 4.02 |
| B. Effectiveness | 1 | | 3 | 18 | 20 | 20 | 3.93 |
| C. Usefulness | 1 | | 3 | 22 | 17 | 19 | 3.85 |
| D. My understanding | 2 | 1 | 1 | 19 | 21 | 18 | 3.90 |
| 3. Legal implications. | | | | | | | |
| A. Appropriateness | 4 | 1 | 3 | 14 | 11 | 29 | 4.10 |
| B. Effectiveness | 4 | 1 | 1 | 19 | 9 | 28 | 4.07 |
| C. Usefulness | 3 | 2 | 2 | 12 | 18 | 25 | 4.05 |
| D. My understanding | 4 | 1 | 2 | 18 | 12 | 25 | 4.00 |
| 7. Total workshop usefulness | 5 | | 1 | 8 | 16 | 32 | 4.39 |
| 8. Total workshop appropriate | 6 | | 2 | 10 | 19 | 25 | 4.16 |
| 9. Accomplished at workshop | 5 | | 1 | 14 | 24 | 18 | 4.04 |
| 10. Workshop structure | 5 | | | 9 | 23 | 25 | 4.28 |

## TABLE 4
## FREQUENCIES OF RATINGS AND MEAN RATINGS FOR DODGE CITY WITHOUT SCK-SEC

N = 46

| Session and Item | Ratings | | | | | | Mean |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |
| 1. Increasing awareness of professionalism. | | | | | | | |
| A. Appropriateness | 1 | | 1 | 4 | 13 | 27 | 4.47 |
| B. Effectiveness | 1 | | 1 | 8 | 11 | 25 | 4.33 |
| C. Usefulness | 1 | | 2 | 10 | 11 | 22 | 4.18 |
| D. My understanding | 2 | | | 7 | 12 | 25 | 4.41 |
| 2. Overview of laws. | | | | | | | |
| A. Appropriateness | 1 | | 2 | 12 | 18 | 13 | 3.93 |
| B. Effectiveness | 1 | | 1 | 15 | 12 | 17 | 4.00 |
| C. Usefulness | 1 | | 2 | 16 | 12 | 15 | 3.89 |
| D. My understanding | 2 | | | 15 | 15 | 14 | 3.98 |
| 3. Legal implications. | | | | | | | |
| A. Appropriateness | 4 | | 2 | 12 | 7 | 21 | 4.12 |
| B. Effectiveness | 4 | | 1 | 16 | 4 | 21 | 4.07 |
| C. Usefulness | 3 | 1 | 1 | 11 | 12 | 18 | 4.05 |
| D. My understanding | 4 | | 2 | 13 | 9 | 18 | 4.02 |
| 7. Total workshop usefulness | 5 | | 1 | 5 | 7 | 28 | 4.51 |
| 8. Total workshop appropriate | 6 | | 2 | 6 | 11 | 21 | 4.23 |
| 9. Accomplished at workshop | 5 | | 1 | 8 | 17 | 15 | 4.12 |
| 10. Workshop structure | 5 | | | 7 | 16 | 18 | 4.27 |

## TABLE 5

## FREQUENCIES OF RATINGS AND MEAN RATINGS FOR DODGE CITY SCK-SEC ONLY

N = 16

| Session and Item | Ratings 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Increasing awareness of professionalism. | | | | | | | |
| A. Appropriateness | | | | 4 | 6 | 6 | 4.13 |
| B. Effectiveness | | | | 6 | 5 | 5 | 3.94 |
| C. Usefulness | | 1 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 7 | 3.88 |
| D. My understanding | | 1 | | 5 | 5 | 5 | 3.81 |
| 2. Overview of laws. | | | | | | | |
| A. Appropriateness | | | | 2 | 8 | 6 | 4.25 |
| B. Effectiveness | | | 2 | 3 | 8 | 3 | 3.75 |
| C. Usefulness | | | 1 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3.75 |
| D. My understanding | | 1 | 1 | 4 | 6 | 4 | 3.69 |
| 3. Legal implications. | | | | | | | |
| A. Appropriateness | | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 8 | 4.06 |
| B. Effectiveness | | 1 | | 3 | 5 | 7 | 4.06 |
| C. Usefulness | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 7 | 4.06 |
| D. My understanding | | 1 | | 5 | 3 | 7 | 3.94 |
| 7. Total workshop usefulness | | | | 3 | 9 | 4 | 4.06 |
| 8. Total workshop appropriate | | | | 4 | 8 | 4 | 4.00 |
| 9. Accomplished at workshop | | | | 6 | 7 | 3 | 3.81 |
| 10. Workshop structure | | | | 2 | 7 | 7 | 4.31 |

The ratings for each of the mini-workshops are presented in Table 6. The mini-workshop which was rated the highest in all areas was the Behavior Modification workshop. This is the workshop which also had the highest attendance or participation. The Learning Modes mini-workshop was rated next highest, followed by the ratings for First Aid/Medical. However, all of the ratings were high, indicating that these mini-workshops were considered appropriate, effectively presented, and useful to them, as well as high understanding of the concepts presented.

The mean ratings for each mini-workshop were compared for the various sub-groups for which analyses were made. These mean ratings are presented in Table 7, which shows the number of participants in each sub-group rating each item and the mean rating for each item. As indicated in this table, the mean ratings were fairly consistent for the various sub-groups. The z ratio for comparing mean differences was used to determine if any of the differences were significant. The only significant differences are indicated in the table, and these were for the Communication Skills mini-workshop. The participants from SCK-SEC rated this mini-workshop significantly lower than all of the other groups of participants. Evidently, the participants did not feel that this mini-workshop met their needs. The written comments by these participants indicated that they felt that the topic of this mini-workshop was misleading. Six of the 10 participants wrote that they thought that the topic of the

## TABLE 6

## FREQUENCIES OF RATINGS AND MEAN RATINGS FOR MINIWORKSHOPS FOR ALL PARTICIPANTS N = 127

| Miniworkshop and Items | N | Ratings 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Behavior Modification | | | | | | | |
| A. Appropriateness | 96 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 25 | 66 | 4.60 |
| B. Effectiveness | 94 | 1 | | 10 | 23 | 60 | 4.50 |
| C. Usefulness | 94 | 1 | 1 | 8 | 23 | 61 | 4.50 |
| D. My understanding | 93 | | | 4 | 29 | 60 | 4.60 |
| Learning Modes | | | | | | | |
| A. Appropriateness | 72 | | 2 | 10 | 13 | 47 | 4.46 |
| B. Effectiveness | 71 | | 3 | 12 | 16 | 40 | 4.31 |
| C. Usefulness | 71 | 1 | 3 | 11 | 16 | 40 | 4.28 |
| D. My understanding | 72 | | 1 | 9 | 22 | 40 | 4.40 |
| Communication Skills | | | | | | | |
| A. Appropriateness | 60 | 1 | 6 | 7 | 17 | 29 | 4.12 |
| B. Effectiveness | 60 | 2 | 6 | 11 | 19 | 22 | 3.88 |
| C. Usefulness | 60 | 3 | 6 | 11 | 16 | 24 | 3.87 |
| D. My understanding | 59 | 2 | 4 | 7 | 21 | 25 | 4.07 |
| Characteristics of Exc.Child | | | | | | | |
| A. Appropriateness | 61 | 1 | 2 | 11 | 21 | 26 | 4.13 |
| B. Effectiveness | 61 | 2 | 4 | 17 | 17 | 21 | 3.84 |
| C. Usefulness | 61 | 2 | 4 | 18 | 15 | 22 | 3.84 |
| D. My understanding | 60 | 1 | 5 | 18 | 13 | 23 | 3.87 |
| Methods & Materials | | | | | | | |
| A. Appropriateness | 61 | 1 | 5 | 9 | 15 | 31 | 4.15 |
| B. Effectiveness | 60 | 1 | 6 | 12 | 16 | 25 | 3.97 |
| C. Usefulness | 60 | 1 | 5 | 14 | 15 | 25 | 3.97 |
| D. My understanding | 61 | 1 | 4 | 11 | 18 | 27 | 4.08 |
| First Aid /Medical | | | | | | | |
| A. Appropriateness | 19 | | | 1 | 2 | 16 | 4.79 |
| B. Effectiveness | 18 | | 1 | 2 | 2 | 13 | 4.50 |
| C. Usefulness | 18 | | 1 | 1 | 2 | 14 | 4.61 |
| D. My understanding | 18 | | | 1 | 3 | 14 | 4.72 |

## TABLE 7

## COMPARISON OF MEAN RATINGS FOR MINI-WORKSHOPS

| Workshop & Items | | All | | Hays | | Dodge City | | No SCK-SEC | | SCK-SEC | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | N | Mean | N | Mean | N | Mean | N | Mean | N | Mean |
| Behavior Modifica. | Appropriate | 96 | 4.60 | 46 | 4.59 | 50 | 4.62 | 38. | 4.71 | 12 | 4.33 |
| | Effective | 94 | 4.50 | 44 | 4.48 | 50 | 4.52 | 38 | 4.63 | 12 | 4.17 |
| | Useful | 94 | 4.51 | 44 | 4.46 | 50 | 4.56 | 38 | 4.63 | 12 | 4.33 |
| | Understand | 93 | 4.61 | 44 | 4.57 | 49 | 4.63 | 37 | 4.70 | 12 | 4.42 |
| Learning Modes | Appropriate | 72 | 4.46 | 40 | 4.60 | 32 | 4.28 | 27 | 4.33 | 5 | 4.00 |
| | Effective | 71 | 4.31 | 39 | 4.41 | 32 | 4.19 | 27 | 4.19 | 5 | 4.20 |
| | Useful | 71 | 4.28 | 39 | 4.33 | 32 | 4.22 | 27 | 4.19 | 5 | 4.40 |
| | Understand | 72 | 4.40 | 40 | 4.50 | 32 | 4.28 | 27 | 4.26 | 5 | 4.40 |
| Comm. Skills | Appropriate | 60 | 4.12 | 25 | 4.44 | 35 | 3.89 | 25 | 4.28 | 10 | 2.90** |
| | Effective | 60 | 3.88 | 25 | 4.16 | 35 | 3.69 | 25 | 4.08 | 10 | 2.70** |
| | Useful | 60 | 3.87 | 25 | 4.28 | 35 | 3.57 | 25 | 4.00 | 10 | 2.50** |
| | Understand | 59 | 4.07 | 25 | 4.36 | 34 | 3.85 | 24 | 4.25 | 10 | 2.90** |
| Character, Exc. Chil. | Appropriate | 61 | 4.13 | 34 | 4.27 | 27 | 3.96 | 18 | 4.11 | 9 | 3.67 |
| | Effective | 61 | 3.87 | 34 | 4.03 | 27 | 3.59 | 18 | 3.83 | 9 | 3.11 |
| | Useful | 61 | 3.84 | 34 | 4.00 | 27 | 3.63 | 18 | 3.78 | 9 | 3.33 |
| | Understand | 60 | 3.87 | 34 | 4.12 | 26 | 3.54 | 17 | 3.59 | 9 | 3.44 |
| Methods & Materials | Appropriate | 61 | 4.15 | 28 | 3.86 | 33 | 4.39 | 22 | 4.46 | 11 | 4.27 |
| | Effective | 60 | 3.97 | 27 | 3.63 | 33 | 4.24 | 22 | 4.27 | 11 | 4.18 |
| | Useful | 60 | 3.97 | 27 | 3.63 | 33 | 4.24 | 22 | 4.27 | 11 | 4.18 |
| | Understand | 61 | 4.08 | 28 | 3.93 | 33 | 4.21 | 22 | 4.27 | 11 | 4.09 |
| First Aid | Appropriate | 19 | 4.79 | 11 | 4.91 | 8 | 4.63 | 7 | 4.57 | 1 | 5 |
| | Effective | 18 | 4.50 | 10 | 4.50 | 8 | 4.50 | 7 | 4.43 | 1 | 5 |
| | Useful | 18 | 4.61 | 10 | 4.60 | 8 | 4.63 | 7 | 4.57 | 1 | 5 |
| | Understand | 18 | 4.72 | 10 | 4.80 | 8 | 4.63 | 7 | 4.57 | 1 | 5 |

would cover communication between aides and students. Thus, this is what they expected from this workshop. Evidently the workshop covered communication between aides and teachers.

In addition to the ratings, the participants were asked to write suggestions for future workshops. The written-in responses of the participants are tabulated below, with the number of participants expressing the same concern given under the frequency (f) of each suggestion.

| f | Response (Suggestion) |
|---|---|
| 32 | Mini-workshops should have been longer -- not enough time to cover all aspects of each mini-workshop. |
| 14 | Have mini-workshops in separate rooms -- too hard to hear and concentrate when all workshops were in same room. |
| 9 | Have more discussion and sharing of ideas in workshop. |
| 8 | Communication skills mini-workshop misleading -- thought that this would cover communication between aide and students, not aide and teachers. |
| 7 | Mini-workshops an excellent idea. |
| 7 | Need more information for specific areas - EMR, PSA, Etc. |
| 6 | Would like to attend all mini-workshops, not just 3 of them. |
| 4 | Need more mini-workshops. |
| 3 | Want more handouts covering sessions and topics. |
| 1 | Need more emphasis on speech materials and methods. |
| 1 | Need specifics for SEIMC para-professionals. |
| 1 | Need how to handle stress situations. |
| 1 | Need more on communication skills. |
| 1 | Start later in the morning, have to drive in from distance. |
| 1 | Like the use of people from field as presenters. |

Except for the comments about the Communication Skills mini-workshop, the responses were fairly evenly divided among the participants from Hays and Dodge City. As noted before, most of the comments concerning the Communication Skills mini-workshop were from the participants from SCK-SEC.

## Summary

The para-professionals attending the two workshops in October at Hays and Dodge City expressed a high regard to all aspects of both workshops. High ratings were given to whether or not the workshop sessions were appropriate, effectively presented, and useful to them, as well as indicating that their understanding of the concepts covered was high. Nearly all of the responses were at the high end of the five-point rating scale used to evaluate the workshops. The mini-workshops were consistently highly rated, indicating that the participants felt that they gained much from these sessions. The written-in comments also expressed this fact. Thus, the participants at these two workshops generally were very satisfied with their participation and what they gained from having attended.

Several written-in suggestions were provided for future workshops. Most notably were that the mini-workshops should be longer and that more time should be provided for discussion and sharing ideas. Also, mini-workshops should be held in separate rooms so that there are no distractions from more than one workshop in the same room. Some of the participants expressed a desire for specific information, e.g., specific information for EMR or PSA.

# EVALUATION REPORT FOR PARSONS REGIONAL PARAPROFESSIONAL WORKSHOP

November 28, 1978

by

Larry L. Havlicek

The evaluation report for the Parsons regional paraprofessional workshop will follow the same format as previous reports for these workshops. The same instrument was used for the feedback evaluation and the same types of analyses were done. For this workshop, there were 56 participants who completed and returned the post-session evaluation form. The frequencies of responses for these participants are presented in Tables 1 and 2.

Table 1 presents the tabulations for the first three items on the evaluation form and for the last four items dealing with the total workshop as a unit. For each aspect of the workshop, the participants were asked to rate that aspect with regard to its appropriateness, how effective that aspect was carried out, how useful that aspect will be for them as a paraprofessional, and their understanding of that topic or content area. A five-point rating scale was used, with a rating of "5" indicating a high degree of satisfaction or understanding. As indicated in Table 1, the ratings varied from a high rating of 4.29 for the evaluation of the total workshop usefulness, to a low rating of 3.49 for the evaluation of how effective the session on overview of P. L. 94-142 and 504 regulations was carried out.

Generally, the ratings for the total workshop were slightly higher than the ratings for the three separate areas evaluated. However, as can be seen from Table 1, most of the ratings were 3, 4, or 5, with a few ones and twos. Thus, it appears that most of the participants rated the various aspects of the workshop and the total workshop fairly high.

The tabulations of the ratings for each of the six mini-workshops are presented in Table 2. The number of participants rating each mini-workshop is listed under N and the mean rating is listed under the column headed "Mean". As indicated in the table, the mean ratings were consistently around 4.00 or higher for all workshops, with the highest ratings for the workshop dealing with paraprofessionals in institutional settings. However, only six participants evaluated this workshop. Generally, the ratings for these mini-workshops tended to be fours and fives, indicating a high degree of satisfaction and understanding of these sessions.

In addition to the ratings, participants were asked to make comments concerning the workshop. These comments are summarized below, with the number of participants mentioning each comment given under the frequency (f) column.

| f | Comment |
|---|---|
| 10 | More information about SMH students |
| 5 | Have separate rooms for each mini-workshop |
| 3 | Physical arrangements and facilities poor |
| 2 | More discussion and feedback in groups |

| f | Comments (continued) |
|---|---|
| 2 | More sessions on institutional settings |
| 2 | Not enough time for sessions |
| 2 | Need more workshops like this |
| 1 | Need more help on working with individual students |

A number of the participants indicated that they worked with SMH children and would have liked additional information on SMH. As with the written in comments for other workshops, many of the participants indicated that there should have been individual rooms for each mini-workshop since it was difficult to hear the workshop presentation that they were in because other workshops were going on in the same room. Since this was a consistent comment for all workshops, the evaluator suggests that future workshops take this into consideration, if possible.

## Summary

The feedback from the participants at this workshop indicated that they were satisfied with nearly all aspects of the workshop and indicated that the workshop was appropriate for them, effectively carried out, would be useful to them as a paraprofessional, and that they had a high degree of understanding of the concepts. Thus, it appears that the participants felt that the workshop was very worthwhile and informative. Written in comments supported the ratings, and as with previous workshop evaluations, the participants felt that separate rooms should have been provided for each of the mini-workshops. However, it appears that the participants were very satisfied with what they accomplished at this workshop.

## TABLE 1

## FREQUENCIES OF RATINGS AND MEAN RATINGS FOR PARSONS REGIONAL PARAPROFESSIONAL WORKSHOP

| Session and Item | Ratings | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean |
| 1. Increasing awareness of professionalism. | | | | | | | |
| A. Appropriateness | 3 | 3 | | 12 | 21 | 17 | 3.93 |
| B. Effectiveness | 3 | 1 | 1 | 17 | 23 | 11 | 3.79 |
| C. Usefulness | 3 | | 2 | 11 | 25 | 15 | 4.00 |
| D. My understanding | 3 | 1 | | 10 | 22 | 20 | 4.13 |
| 2. Overview of laws. | | | | | | | |
| A. Appropriateness | 5 | | 5 | 15 | 13 | 13 | 3.77 |
| B. Effectiveness | 5 | 1 | 6 | 20 | 15 | 9 | 3.49 |
| C. Usefulness | 5 | | 4 | 15 | 19 | 13 | 3.80 |
| D. My understanding | 5 | 1 | 3 | 15 | 17 | 15 | 3.82 |
| 3. Legal implications. | | | | | | | |
| A. Appropriateness | 10 | 2 | 2 | 13 | 13 | 11 | 3.74 |
| B. Effectiveness | 9 | 3 | 2 | 17 | 15 | 10 | 3.57 |
| C. Usefulness | 10 | 2 | 3 | 10 | 20 | 11 | 3.76 |
| D. My understanding | 9 | 2 | 3 | 11 | 20 | 11 | 3.75 |
| 7. Total workshop usefulness. | 4 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 13 | 29 | 4.29 |
| 8. Total workshop appropriate. | 5 | | 3 | 15 | 10 | 23 | 4.04 |
| 9. Accomplished at workshop. | 4 | | 1 | 7 | 22 | 22 | 4.25 |
| 10. Workshop structure. | 3 | | 1 | 10 | 16 | 26 | 4.26 |

## TABLE 2

## FREQUENCIES OF RATINGS AND MEAN RATINGS FOR MINI-WORKSHOPS

| Mini-workshop and Items | N | Ratings | | | | | Mean |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |
| Behavior Modification | | | | | | | |
| A. Appropriateness | 42 | | 2 | 3 | 17 | 20 | 4.31 |
| B. Effectiveness | 42 | | 1 | 9 | 18 | 14 | 4.07 |
| C. Usefulness | 42 | 1 | | 10 | 14 | 17 | 4.10 |
| D. My understanding | 42 | | | 5 | 15 | 22 | 4.41 |
| Characteristics of Exc. Children | | | | | | | |
| A. Appropriateness | 20 | | | 2 | 5 | 13 | 4.55 |
| B. Effectiveness | 20 | 1 | | 6 | 6 | 7 | 3.90 |
| C. Usefulness | 20 | | 2 | 4 | 6 | 8 | 4.00 |
| D. My understanding | 20 | | | 4 | 5 | 11 | 4.35 |
| First Aid/Medical | | | | | | | |
| A. Appropriateness | 18 | | | 4 | 8 | 6 | 4.11 |
| B. Effectiveness | 18 | | | 6 | 7 | 5 | 3.94 |
| C. Usefulness | 18 | | | 6 | 5 | 7 | 4.06 |
| D. My understanding | 18 | | | 5 | 7 | 6 | 4.06 |
| Learning Modes | | | | | | | |
| A. Appropriateness | 30 | | | 2 | 6 | 22 | 4.67 |
| B. Effectiveness | 31 | | | 1 | 8 | 22 | 4.68 |
| C. Usefulness | 31 | | | 2 | 8 | 21 | 4.61 |
| D. My understanding | 31 | | | 1 | 7 | 23 | 4.71 |
| Methods and Materials | | | | | | | |
| A. Appropriateness | 32 | 1 | | 4 | 10 | 17 | 4.31 |
| B. Effectiveness | 32 | | 1 | 3 | 11 | 17 | 4.38 |
| C. Usefulness | 32 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 9 | 17 | 4.25 |
| D. My understanding | 32 | | | 1 | 9 | 22 | 4.66 |
| Paras in Institutional Settings | | | | | | | |
| A. Appropriateness | 6 | | | | 1 | 5 | 4.83 |
| B. Effectiveness | 6 | | | | 1 | 5 | 4.83 |
| C. Usefulness | 6 | | | | 1 | 5 | 4.83 |
| D. My understanding | 6 | | | | 2 | 4 | 4.67 |

# EVALUATION REPORT FOR
# FACILITATORS WORKSHOP

BY

Larry L. Havlicek

This is a report of the post-session evaluations used to provide formative feedback information for the facilitators workshop held in November, 1978. Evaluation forms were completed by participants at the end of the workshop using the evaluation form attached as the last pages of this report. A total of 37 participants completed the evaluation forms.

A five-point rating scale was used to evaluate each aspect of the workshop and each mini-workshop. For each aspect and mini-workshop, the participants were asked to respond to the following four items:

Effectiveness of the presentation,

Importance of the presentation,

Usefulness of the presentation to them in working with paraprofessionals, and

Their understanding of the concepts presented during each aspect of the workshop.

The participants were also asked to rate the entire workshop as a unit using the same four items. For these items, the higher the rating, i.e., a rating of "5", the higher the degree of satisfaction or understanding. The participants were also asked to write in comments about the workshop.

The responses of the participants were keypunched and the analyses were done by computer using the SPSS FREQUENCIES program.

The tabulation of the responses of the 37 participants who completed and turned in their evaluation forms is presented in Table 1. Table 1 also presents the mean value for each item. The number of participants who did not respond to any item is given under the column headed "0", which was to be used by participants if they did not attend that session or did not wish to rate that item.

As can be noted in Table 1, most of the ratings were consistently high for nearly all items. The modal response for the majority of the items was "5", indicating that most of the participants rated the items at the highest point on the scale. The mean values are generally higher than "4" which also reflects the high positive ratings of the participants. There were only four mean ratings below "4", and they were only under "4" by .04. Also, one notes that there were only a few "1" or "2" ratings. Thus, it appears that the majority of the participants expressed high positive ratings for all aspects of the workshop.

Of special note are the exceptionally high ratings for the presentation by Vera Yager, "Is she for real", and for the session on hands-on experience in skills and techniques for training paraprofessionals. The written in comments tended to support these two aspects of the workshop.

The same four items were used to evaluate the four mini-workshops which were part of the total workshop. The tabulation of the ratings and mean ratings for each mini-workshop are presented in Table 2. As can be noted, the majority of the ratings

## TABLE 1

## FREQUENCIES OF RATINGS AND MEAN RATINGS FOR FACILITATORS WORKSHOP EVALUATION

| Session and Item | Ratings | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean |
| 1. Presentation by Whelan | | | | | | | |
| A. Effectiveness | 6 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 6 | 18 | 4.26 |
| B. Importance | 6 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 9 | 16 | 4.23 |
| C. Usefulness | 6 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 11 | 14 | 4.16 |
| D. My understanding | 6 | | | 1 | 7 | 23 | 4.71 |
| 2. Presentation by Yager | | | | | | | |
| A. Effectiveness | | | | | 12 | 25 | 4.68 |
| B. Importance | | | | 2 | 10 | 25 | 4.62 |
| C. Usefulness | | 1 | 1 | 4 | 10 | 21 | 4.32 |
| D. My understanding | | | | 1 | 10 | 26 | 4.68 |
| 3. Overview of learning environment | | | | | | | |
| A. Effectiveness | 11 | | | 6 | 10 | 10 | 4.15 |
| B. Importance | 11 | | | 5 | 7 | 14 | 4.35 |
| C. Usefulness | 11 | | | 4 | 13 | 9 | 4.19 |
| D. My understanding | 11 | | | 5 | 10 | 11 | 4.23 |
| 4. Update on grant activities | | | | | | | |
| A. Effectiveness | 7 | | | 9 | 13 | 8 | 3.97 |
| B. Importance | 6 | | | 5 | 11 | 15 | 4.32 |
| C. Usefulness | 6 | | | 9 | 9 | 13 | 4.13 |
| D. My understanding | 6 | | | 5 | 17 | 9 | 4.13 |
| 5. Hands-on Experience | | | | | | | |
| A. Effectiveness | 12 | | | 1 | 5 | 19 | 4.72 |
| B. Importance | 12 | | | 1 | 4 | 20 | 4.76 |
| C. Usefulness | 12 | | 1 | 1 | 4 | 19 | 4.64 |
| D. My understanding | 12 | | | 1 | 5 | 19 | 4.72 |

TABLE 1
(Continued)

| Session and Item | Ratings | | | | | | Mean |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |
| 6. Update on media and materials | | | | | | | |
| A. Effectiveness | 12 | | | 8 | 10 | 7 | 3.96 |
| B. Importance | 12 | | 1 | 6 | 11 | 7 | 3.96 |
| C. Usefulness | 12 | | | 7 | 10 | 8 | 4.04 |
| D. My understanding | 12 | | | 8 | 10 | 7 | 3.96 |
| 10. Total workshop Usefulness | 2 | | 1 | 3 | 20 | 11 | 4.17 |
| 11. Importance of total workshop to meet my needs | 3 | | 2 | 5 | 14 | 13 | 4.12 |
| 12. Workshop accomplishments | | | 1 | 4 | 17 | 15 | 4.24 |
| 13. Workshop structure | | | 1 | 3 | 13 | 20 | 4.41 |

listed in Table 2 are ratings of "4" and "5", with the modal rating equal to "5" for all but two of the items. Also, all of the mean ratings are above "4" with the exception of two mean ratings. Thus, the participants reacted very positively to the mini-workshops, especially to the workshop on body management.

In addition to the ratings, the participants were asked to write in comments and/or suggestions concerning the workshop. These comments are summarized below with the number of participants mentioning each comment listed under the frequency (f) column.

| f | Comment |
|---|---|
| 7 | Vera is fantastic! |
| 4 | Have small group sessions with presenters as well as the large-group presentations so that participants could interact with each presenter. |

## TABLE 2

## FREQUENCIES OF RATINGS AND MEAN RATINGS FOR MINI-WORKSHOPS

| Mini-workshop and Items | N | Ratings | | | | | Mean |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |
| Behavior Modification | | | | | | | |
| Effectiveness of training | 18 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 4 | 7 | 3.83 |
| Importance of training | 18 | | 1 | 4 | 5 | 8 | 4.11 |
| Usefulness of training | 18 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 7 | 3.89 |
| My understanding | 18 | | 1 | 4 | 5 | 8 | 4.11 |
| Body Management | | | | | | | |
| Effectiveness of training | 22 | | | 1 | 4 | 17 | 4.73 |
| Importance of training | 22 | | | 1 | 7 | 14 | 4.14 |
| Usefulness of training | 22 | 1 | | 1 | 4 | 16 | 4.54 |
| My understanding | 22 | 1 | | 1 | 5 | 15 | 4.50 |
| Methods and Materials | | | | | | | |
| Effectiveness of training | 19 | | 2 | 4 | 3 | 10 | 4.00 |
| Importance of training | 19 | | | 3 | 8 | 8 | 4.26 |
| Usefulness of training | 19 | | 1 | 5 | 3 | 10 | 4.11 |
| My understanding | 19 | | 1 | 5 | 5 | 8 | 4.05 |
| Planning & Delivery of Inservice | | | | | | | |
| Effectiveness of training | 20 | | 1 | 4 | 7 | 8 | 4.10 |
| Importance of training | 20 | | | 2 | 7 | 11 | 4.45 |
| Usefulness of training | 20 | | 1 | 4 | 6 | 9 | 4.15 |
| My understanding | 20 | | | 5 | 9 | 6 | 4.05 |

| f | Comments (Continued) |
|---|---|
| 2 | Would like a list of all materials available through KSDE |
| 1 | Delete slide program - was a waste of time. |
| 1 | Have more specific information on topics covered. |
| 1 | Have more time for sharing of ideas. |
| 1 | Have a no-smoking area |
| 1 | Dr. Whelan is excellent |

## Summary

The reactions of the participants indicated that the workshop sessions were effectively presented, important to the participants in working with paraprofessionals, would be useful to them in working with paraprofessionals, and that their understanding of the concepts presented was very high. Nearly all of the responses of the participants were at the high or positive end of the five-point rating scale, indicating a very favorable rating for each item for each session. Especially high ratings were given to the sessions conducted by Vera Yager. Written-in comments by the participants supported the ratings as well as providing suggestions for future workshops.

# EVALUATION REPORT FOR
# SECOND FACILITATORS WORKSHOP

February 22 & 23, 1979

Wichita, Kansas

by

Larry L. Havlicek

The second facilitators workshop was evaluated using a nine item Likert rating scale which provided information from the participants on all aspects of the workshop. Each participant was asked to complete the rating form as the last activity of this workshop.

The rating scale that was used asked each participant to rate each aspect of the workshop on a five-point scale, with "5" indicating a high degree of satisfaction and "1" a low degree of satisfaction. Each major activity was rated as to how effective the activity or presentation was, how important that activity or presentation was to them as a facilitator, the usefulness of the presentation or activity was to them, and their understanding of the presentation or activity. In addition to asking each participant to rate each presentation or activity, the participants were asked to rate the mini-workshops that they attended using the same items and scales as well as to rate the overall workshop on the same four items.

The responses of the participants were keypunched and the analyses were done on the computer using the FREQUENCIES program in the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). The results of these analyses are presented in the following report.

The results of the analyses for the nine items covering the major aspects of the workshop as well as the overall ratings are presented in Table 1. As indicated in this table, the mean ratings varied from a high of 4.33 for the participants' rating of their understanding of the administrative considerations involved in training paraprofessionals, to a low of 3.20 for the rating of the usefulness of the presentation on Transactional Analysis.

The highest ratings were for the presentations on the administrative considerations and for the presentation on the update on grant activities. The importance rating for the presentation on media and materials was also rated high. The lowest ratings were given to the presentation on Transactional Analysis. Some of the written in comments also indicated that this presentation was not as good as what participants expected.

With regard to the total workshop, the participants generally tended to rate the usefulness, importance, and what was accomplished quite high. The structure of the workshop, i.e., the way tasks were handled and the overall structure of the workshop was rated high. Thus, it appears that the participants felt that the workshop was beneficial to them and worthwhile.

## TABLE 1

## FREQUENCIES OF RATINGS AND MEAN RATINGS FOR WICHITA REGIONAL FACILITATORS WORKSHOP

| Session and Item | Ratings | | | | | | Mean |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |
| 1. Overview of Administrative Considerations | | | | | | | |
| A. Effectiveness | 4 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 9 | 11 | 4.13 |
| B. Importance | 1 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 7 | 12 | 4.17 |
| C. Usefulness | 1 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 6 | 11 | 4.00 |
| D. My understanding | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 11 | 11 | 4.33 |
| 2. Transactional Analysis | | | | | | | |
| A. Effectiveness | 0 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 7 | 7 | 3.52 |
| B. Importance | 0 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 12 | 4 | 3.48 |
| C. Usefulness | 0 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 11 | 2 | 3.20 |
| D. My understanding | 1 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 12 | 4 | 3.63 |
| 3. Update on grant activities | | | | | | | |
| A. Effectiveness | 5 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 8 | 7 | 4.05 |
| B. Importance | 5 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 11 | 6 | 4.15 |
| C. Usefulness | 5 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 8 | 5 | 3.90 |
| D. My understanding | 5 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 10 | 6 | 4.10 |
| 4. Media and Materials | | | | | | | |
| A. Effectiveness | 1 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 12 | 3 | 3.63 |
| B. Importance | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 16 | 6 | 4.17 |
| C. Usefulness | 1 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 13 | 5 | 3.88 |
| D. My understanding | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 16 | 5 | 4.08 |
| 5. Information on evaluation | | | | | | | |
| A. Effectiveness | 4 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 12 | 7 | 4.14 |
| B. Importance | 4 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 13 | 1 | 3.52 |
| C. Usefulness | 4 | 2 | 0 | 6 | 12 | 1 | 3.48 |
| D. My understanding | 4 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 14 | 1 | 3.67 |

TABLE 1
(Continued)

|  | Ratings |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Item | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean |
| 8. Usefulness of total workshop | 2 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 8 | 6 | 3.78 |
| 9. Importance of total workshop | 2 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 8 | 7 | 3.87 |
| 10. Rate accomplishment | 1 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 11 | 5 | 3.79 |
| 11. Structure of workshop | 1 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 5 | 10 | 4.00 |

The tabulation of the ratings for each of the mini-workshops is presented in Table 2. Generally, higher ratings were given to the mini-workshop on behavior modification than for the mini-workshop on methods and materials. It appears that the mini-workshops on behavior modification and the characteristics of the exceptional child were more effective, more important, more useful, and the participants had a better understanding of these concepts, than for the mini-workshop on methods and materials. However, one has to note that the number of participants who indicated they attended and rated the mini-workshop on the characteristics of the exceptional child was small (n = 3).

In addition to the ratings, the participants were asked to make comments concerning any aspects of the workshop and to provide suggestions as to how future workshops might be improved. Their responses are tabulated on page 6. The first column (f) shows the number of participants who made similar comments.

## TABLE 2

## FREQUENCIES OF RATINGS AND MEAN RATINGS FOR MINI-WORKSHOPS

| Mini-Workshop and Items | Ratings | | | | | | Mean |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |
| Behavior Modification | | | | | | | |
| A. Effectiveness | 10 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 9 | 4.33 |
| B. Importance | 10 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 9 | 4.40 |
| C. Usefulness | 10 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 9 | 4.33 |
| D. My understanding | 10 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 8 | 4.47 |
| Characteristics of Exc. Child. | | | | | | | |
| A. Effectiveness | 3 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 8 | 10 | 4.23 |
| B. Importance | 3 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 10 | 8 | 4.09 |
| C. Usefulness | 3 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 9 | 9 | 4.14 |
| D. My understanding | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 12 | 4.55 |
| Methods and Materials | | | | | | | |
| A. Effectiveness | 12 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 3.31 |
| B. Importance | 12 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3.62 |
| C. Usefulness | 12 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 3.31 |
| D. My understanding | 12 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 4 | 3.93 |

## Tabulation of Written Responses

| f | Comment |
|---|---|
| 4 | Workshop was very well done - got a lot out of it. |
| 2 | Have one yearly meeting to:<br>1. review materials available for training.<br>2. describe training used by facilitators.<br>3. updates on forms, grant activities, legal aspects, etc.<br>4. review consultants available for training. |
| 2 | T A presentation was not good - not dynamically presented. |
| 1 | Methods and Media mini-workshop wasn/t what was expected. |
| 1 | Main speaker did not meet expectations. |
| 1 | Characteristics of exceptional children was redundant -- have had at every meeting. |
| 1 | How about a group dinner on a pay-your-own-way basis. |
| 1 | Have longer social hour in a place to relax and visit. |
| 1 | Start one hour later in the morning for those who drive in. |
| 1 | Want small group "rap sessions" to share concerns and ideas. |
| 1 | Workshop could be accomplished in one day, not two. |
| 1 | Have business meeting the first thing. |
| 1 | Have superintendent or director attend workshop. |
| 1 | Have monthly newsletter/contact to explain workshops and encourage attendance. |
| 1 | Keep para-program in perspective of other areas of special educatio |
| 1 | Want more information on secondary level, resource room, and mainstreaming. |
| 1 | Meet on East Kellogg rather than downtown. |
| 1 | More film coverage on jr. hi. level and mainstreaming. |

## Summary

From the responses of the participants attending the second facilitators workshop, it appears that the participants felt that the workshop was effectively presented, important to them as facilitators, would be useful to them, and that their understanding of the concepts presented was high. Nearly all of the responses on the five-point rating scale were at the high end indicating a high degree of satisfaction, and all of the mean ratings were above 3, the neutral point of the rating scales. Generally the highest ratings were for the sessions on administrative considerations and for the update on grant activities, and lowest for the session on Transactional Analysis. The written in comments and suggestions were consistent with the ratings, and the participants provided many suggestions which should be considered for future workshops.

# EVALUATION REPORT FOR
# "PARAPROFESSIONAL: A LOOK TO THE FUTURE"
# THE FIRST STATEWIDE CONFERENCE FOR PARAPROFESSIONALS

March 30 and 31, 1979

Topeka, Kansas

By

Larry L. Havlicek

This is a report of the post-session evaluation of the first statewide conference for paraprofessionals held in Topeka on March 30 and 31, 1979. Each participant was asked to complete an evaluation form which contained items covering all aspects of the workshop. The tabulations and analyses of the responses of the participants will be presented in this evaluation report.

A total of 238 participants returned evaluation forms completed at the end of the workshop. The responses of these participants were keypunched into IBM cards and all analyses were then done by computer. It should be noted that it is assumed that the participants responded on the basis of their reactions to the presentations and workshop objectives. However, with this large of group of participants, it is not possible to know on what basis each participant responded. Thus, as with any survey evaluation, one must rely on the integrity of the respondents and make the assumption that the responses represent the reactions of the participants at large.

The rating scale that was used for the workshop evaluation consisted of eleven items dealing with specific aspects of the workshop. The participants were to rate the effectiveness of the presentation and the usefulness of the presentation using a five-point rating scale in which "1" was a low rating and "5" was a high rating. The participants were then asked to rate the degree of attainment of the seven specific objectives for the workshop using the same five-point scale. The last part of the rating form asked participants to write in additional comments or suggestions pertinent to the workshop.

As indicated before, the responses of the participants were keypunched into IBM cards and the analyses were done on the computer using the FREQUENCIES program of the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences. The results will be presented as separate frequency tabulations for each item as well as the mean rating for each item. The written in responses were categorized and then were tabulated as to the number of similar responses which were categorized together.

The Table starting on page 3 shows the number of participants who responded to each rating for each item. Under the column headed "NA" is listed the number of people who did not respond to that item. Under the column headed "Mean" is presented the mean rating for each item. This is based only on the number of participants who rated the item "1" through "5" and does not include those who marked "0". The mean ratings provide an overall comparison of the ratings for the participants for the various topics and objectives.

## TABLE 1

## TABULATION OF RATINGS AND MEAN RATINGS

| Session and Item | Ratings | | | | | | Mean |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |
| 1. A Special Message by Loretta Gallagher. | | | | | | | |
| Effectiveness | 9 | 4 | 10 | 74 | 85 | 56 | 3.78 |
| Usefulness | 9 | 6 | 15 | 81 | 83 | 44 | 3.63 |
| 2. Keynote speech by Richard White. | | | | | | | |
| Effectiveness | 1 | 1 | 1 | 10 | 37 | 188 | 4.73 |
| Usefulness | 1 | 3 | 2 | 14 | 55 | 163 | 4.57 |
| 3. "Reality and the Vital Link by George Kaplan. | | | | | | | |
| Effectiveness | 5 | | 4 | 31 | 78 | 120 | 4.35 |
| Usefulness | 5 | 1 | 11 | 40 | 77 | 104 | 4.18 |
| 4. The Paraprofessional and CEC by Rusty Welch. | | | | | | | |
| Effectiveness | 72 | 10 | 13 | 37 | 67 | 39 | 3.68 |
| Usefulness | 72 | 10 | 20 | 45 | 55 | 36 | 3.52 |
| 5. "Is she for Real" by Vera Yager.* | | | | | | | |
| Effectiveness | 210 | 2 | | 9 | 9 | 8 | 3.75 |
| Usefulness | 210 | 3 | | 8 | 10 | 7 | 3.64 |
| 6. Panel Evaluation. | | | | | | | |
| Effectiveness | 111 | | 1 | 24 | 58 | 44 | 4.14 |
| Uesfulness | 110 | | 1 | 26 | 57 | 44 | 4.13 |
| 8. Mini-workshop: Administrative Concerns | | | | | | | |
| Effectiveness | 135 | 8 | 3 | 21 | 33 | 38 | 3.87 |
| Usefulness | 135 | 8 | 5 | 23 | 30 | 37 | 3.81 |
| 9. Mini-workshop: Body Management | | | | | | | |
| Effectiveness | 162 | | 2 | 17 | 25 | 32 | 4.15 |
| Usefulness | 162 | | 5 | 22 | 23 | 26 | 3.92 |
| 10. Mini-workshop: Transactional Analysis | | | | | | | |
| Effectiveness | 97 | 14 | 24 | 39 | 40 | 24 | 3.26 |
| Usefulness | 97 | 19 | 20 | 37 | 39 | 26 | 3.23 |
| 11. Mini-workshop: Behavior Management | | | | | | | |
| Effectiveness | 120 | 2 | 8 | 9 | 41 | 58 | 4.23 |
| Usefulness | 120 | 2 | 10 | 6 | 38 | 62 | 4.25 |

*Participants who rated this session inserted Bill Boomer's name in place of Vera Yager who was not at the meeting.

As can be noted from Table 1, most of the responses of the participants were 3, 4 or 5, with relatively few ratings of 1 or 2 which would reflect low ratings. Thus, most of the participants expressed high or positive ratings towards the sessions and activities of the workshop. The mean ratings varied from a low of 3.23 for the mini-workshop on Transactional Analysis to a high of 4.73 for the keynote speech by Richard White. The ratings for "effectiveness" and "usefulness" were fairly consistent for each item. As noted on the Table for Item 5, the participants who marked this item wrote in Bill Boomer's name as the presenter. Vera Yager could not attend the workshop.

There were ten mini-sessions and each of these were tabulated separately. The results of the tabulations for these mini-sessions are presented in Table 2 using the same format as in Table 1. As can be noted from Table 2, the mean ratings varied from a high of 4.46 for the mini-session on Personal and Social Adjustment to a low of 3.11 for the mini-session on Hearing Impaired. It should be noted that the total number of participants rating the mini-sessions varied from a low of 2 for the mini-session on Gifted to a high of 54 for the mini-session on Learning Disabilities. As indicated above, several participants wrote in Bill Boomers name in place of Vera Yager on the first page of the rating form. Possibly these ratings were intended for the Learning Disabilities mini-session. However, at this point all one can go by is the frequencies as they were made for each session. Possibly the ratings might have been different if all of the participants marked in the appropriate space.

## TABLE 2

## TABULATION OF RATINGS FOR MINI-SESSIONS

| Session and Item | | Ratings | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean |
| Trainable Mentally Retarded | | | | | | | |
| Effectiveness | 35 | 1 | 2 | 12 | 13 | 7 | 3.66 |
| Usefulness | 37 | 1 | 3 | 12 | 13 | 8 | 3.65 |
| Educable Mentally Retarded | | | | | | | |
| Effectiveness | 30 | | 5 | 3 | 12 | 5 | 3.68 |
| Usefulness | 25 | 3 | 1 | 5 | 10 | 6 | 3.60 |
| Learning Disabilities | | | | | | | |
| Effectiveness | 54 | 2 | 10 | 11 | 24 | 7 | 3.44 |
| Usefulness | 54 | 3 | 8 | 10 | 26 | 7 | 3.48 |
| Severely Multiply Handicapped/Deaf-Blind | | | | | | | |
| Effectiveness | 26 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 10 | 7 | 3.81 |
| Usefulness | 26 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 11 | 7 | 3.85 |
| Visually Impaired | | | | | | | |
| Effectiveness | 4 | | | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4.25 |
| Usefulness | 4 | | 1 | | 1 | 2 | 4.00 |
| Hearing Impaired | | | | | | | |
| Effectiveness | 9 | 2 | | 1 | 5 | 1 | 3.33 |
| Usefulness | 9 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 3.11 |
| Personal & Social Adjustment | | | | | | | |
| Effectiveness | 35 | | | 2 | 15 | 18 | 4.46 |
| Usefulness | 35 | | | 3 | 14 | 18 | 4.43 |
| Early Childhood | | | | | | | |
| Effectiveness | 11 | | 1 | 4 | 1 | 5 | 3.91 |
| Usefulness | 11 | | 1 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 3.82 |
| Gifted | | | | | | | |
| Effectiveness | 2 | | | | | 2 | 5.00 |
| Usefulness | 2 | | | | 2 | | 3.00 |
| Physically Impaired | | | | | | | |
| Effectiveness | 5 | | | 2 | 1 | 2 | 4.00 |
| Usefulness | 5 | | | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3.80 |

## TABLE 3

## TABULATION OF RATINGS AND MEAN RATINGS FOR ATTAINMENT OF OBJECTIVES

| Workshop Objective | Ratings | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean |
| 1. Explore overall role of Special Education Paraprofessional. | 8 | 3 | 5 | 31 | 91 | 100 | 4.22 |
| 2. Examine role of para from a national perspective. | 10 | 6 | 11 | 33 | 92 | 86 | 4.06 |
| 3. Role of para as an educ. team member. | 8 | 3 | 6 | 25 | 86 | 110 | 4.28 |
| 4. Look at training considerations of paras. | 15 | 6 | 14 | 65 | 80 | 58 | 3.76 |
| 5. Present information on special education categorical areas. | 15 | 4 | 22 | 52 | 84 | 61 | 3.79 |
| 6. Present specific skills for para's assignments. | 15 | 8 | 33 | 61 | 77 | 44 | 3.52 |
| 7. Provide time for para to meet informally with presenters and other paras. | 15 | 7 | 15 | 46 | 75 | 80 | 3.92 |

The responses of the participants' rating of the degree of attainment of the specific objectives for the workshop are presented in Table 3 above. As indicated in this table, the participants rated the objective "To examine the role of the paraprofessional as an educational team member." as attained to the greatest degree, and the presentation of specific skills for their assignments/duties as attained to the smallest degree. Possibly the latter is a reflection on the variety of specific skills that the paraprofessionals felt that they wanted. However, since the majority of the ratings are at the high end of the rating scale, it appears that the participants felt that most of the workshop objectives were attained to a fairly high degree.

In addition to the ratings, the participants were given an opportunity to write in additional comments and/or suggestions. These are tabulated below with the number of participants who mentioned that idea given under the frequency (f) column.

| f | Comment or Suggestion |
|---|---|
| 65 | GREAT! Very good, Super! Best I've attended. Do again. |
| 20 | Provide more time for speakers. |
| 14 | Have Richard White again and give him more time to speek. |
| 11 | Shorter introductions on Friday morning. |
| 10 | Include teachers - inform them of paras role. |
| 9 | Good speakers. Give them more time to speek. |
| 9 | Hold next conference in Wichita location. |
| 9 | More specific information, suggestions, lesson plans, hints. |
| 8 | Have George Kaplan again, give him more time. |
| 7 | Have two full days for the workshop. |
| 6 | Have more time for discussion. |
| 6 | Have longer breaks between sessions. |
| 6 | Give college credit for workshop. |
| 6 | Have rolls for Saturday morning coffee. |
| 5 | Transactional Analysis session confusing. |
| 4 | Keep us informed of coming workshops. |
| 3 | Provide more information for speech paraprofessionals. |
| 3 | Include things for Junior and Senior High School levels. |
| 2 | Have no-smoking sections. |
| 1 | Have panel of speakers for each mini-session. |
| 1 | Have more presenters from large districts - not just small coops. |
| 1 | Include areas from Title I. |
| 1 | Include Voc. Ed. and career development. |

## Summary

The paraprofessionals attending the first statewide conference for paraprofessionals expressed a high regard to all aspects of the workshop and felt that the goals of the workshop were attained to a high degree. High ratings were given regarding the effectiveness of the workshop and the usefulness of the information gained from attending the workshop. Nearly all of the responses of the participants were at the high end of the rating scales used, indicating a high regard and a high degree of satisfaction from attending the workshop. The written-in comments also reflect a high degree of satisfaction from attending the workshop. Thus, it is evident that the participants were very satisfied with having attended this workshop and with what they gained from having attended.

# APPENDIX A

## AGENDAS FROM REGIONAL WORKSHOPS

Paraprofessional Conference of Kansas (P.C.K.)

## THE TOPEKA REGIONAL PARAPROFESSIONAL WORKSHOP

Ramada Inn Downtown
Grand Ball Room

Saturday, September 23, 1978
9:00 a.m. - 4:00 p.m.

## AGENDA

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 9:00 - 9:30 | Registration & Coffee<br>Introductory Remarks | Mary Goff, Phyllis Kelly, & Loretta Gallagher |
| 9:30 - 10:30 | Keynote<br>"The Emerging Role of the Special Education Paraprofessional" | Dr. Bill Boomer |
| 10:30 - 11:15 | P.L. 94-142, 504 regulations and the Role of the Special Education Paraprofessional | Betty Weithers |
| 11:15 - 12:15 | Legal Implications of the Role of the Special Education Paraprofessional | Phyllis Kelly |
| 12:15 - 1:30 | LUNCH | |
| 1:30 - 3:00 | *MINI-WORKSHOPS: (The time frame for each is 30 minutes) | |
| | 1. First Aid/Medical Aspects | Evelyn Hale & Kay Coward |
| | 2. Behavior Management | Linda Thurston |
| | 3. Characteristics of Exceptional Children | Carol Nigus |
| | 4. Methods & Materials for Special Education Programs | Ann Fritz & Ronda Showalter |
| | 5. The Paraprofessional in Institutional Settings | Cindy Billionus |
| | 6. Learning Modes | Bill Boomer |

*Each topic will be presented 3 times.
*Choose 3 out of the 6 workshops you would like to attend.
*You will be able to participate in 3 mini-workshops.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 3:00 - 4:00 | Wrap-Up<br>"How to implement the information you've learned today!" | Phyllis Kelly, Mary Goff, & Loretta Gallagher |
| | EVALUATION | |

Paraprofessional Conference of Kansas (P.C.K.)

## THE DODGE CITY REGIONAL PARAPROFESSIONAL WORKSHOP

Administration Office

Thursday, October 12, 1978
9:00 a.m. - 4:00 p.m.

## AGENDA

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 9:00 - 9:30 | Registration & Coffee<br>Introductory Remarks | Mary Goff & Phyllis Kelly |
| 9:30 - 10:30 | Keynote<br>"The Emerging Role of the Special Education Paraprofessional" | Dr. Bill Boomer |
| 10:30 - 11:15 | P. L. 94-142, 504 regulations and the Role of the Special Education Paraprofessional | Hamp Smith |
| 11:15 - 12:15 | Legal Implications of the Role of the Special Education Paraprofessional | Phyllis Kelly |
| 12:15 - 1:30 | LUNCH | |
| 1:30 - 3:00 | *MINI-WORKSHOPS: (The time frame for each is 30 minutes) | |
| | 1. First Aid/Medical Aspects | Vicki Maschewski |
| | 2. Behavior Management | Donna Knoll |
| | 3. Characteristics of Exceptional Children | Don Binder |
| | 4. Methods & Materials for Special Education Programs | Donna Steward |
| | 5. Communication Skills | Deana Scott |
| | 6. Learning Modes | Dr. Bill Boomer |

*Each topic will be presented 3 times.
*Choose 3 out of the 6 workshops you would like to attend.
*You will be able to participate in 3 mini-workshops.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 3:00 - 4:00 | Wrap-Up<br>"How to implement the information you've learned today!" | Phyllis Kelly & Mary Goff |
| | EVALUATION | |

Paraprofessional Conference of Kansas (P.C.K.)

# THE HAYS REGIONAL PARAPROFESSIONAL WORKSHOP

| | |
|---|---|
| Fort Hays State University<br>Student Union<br>Black & Gold Room | Friday, October 13, 1978<br>9:00 a.m. - 3:00 p.m. |

## AGENDA

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 9:00 - 9:30 | Registration<br>Introductory Remarks | Mary Goff & Phyllis Kelly |
| 9:30 - 10:30 | Keynote<br>"The Emerging Role of the Special Education Paraprofessional" | Dr. Bill Boomer |
| 10:30 - 11:05 | P.L. 94-142, 504 regulations and the Role of the Special Education Paraprofessional | Albert Marten |
| 11:05 - 12:00 | Legal Implications of the Role of the Special Education Paraprofessional. | Phyllis Kelly |
| 12:00 - 1:00 | LUNCH | |
| 1:00 - 2:30 | *MINI-WORKSHOPS: (The time frame for each is 30 minutes) | |
| | 1. First Aid/Medical Aspects | Donna Stehno |
| | 2. Behavior Management | Renee Kiger |
| | 3. Characteristics of Exceptional Children | Dee Glazier |
| | 4. Methods & Materials for Special Education Programs | Joann Reynolds |
| | 5. Communication Skills | Dwayne Scott |
| | 6. Learning Modes | Dr. Bill Boomer |

*Each topic will be presented 3 times.
*Choose 3 out of the 6 workshops you would like to attend.
*You will be able to participate in 3 mini-workshops.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 2:30 - 3:00 | Wrap-Up<br>"How to implement the information you've learned today!" | Phyllis Kelly & Mary Goff |
| | EVALUATION | |

Paraprofessional Conference of Kansas (P.C.K.)

## THE WICHITA REGIONAL PARAPROFESSIONAL WORKSHOP

| | |
|---|---|
| Wichita Hilton Inn | Monday, October 30, 1978 |
| South Ball Room | 9:00 a.m. - 4:00 p.m. |

### AGENDA

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 9:00 - 9:30 | Registration & Coffee<br>Introductory Remarks | Mary Goff & Phyllis Kelly |
| 9:30 - 10:30 | Keynote<br>"The Emerging Role of the Special Education Paraprofessional" | Dr. Bill Boomer |
| 10:30 - 11:15 | P.L. 94-142, 504 regulations and the Role of the Special Education Paraprofessional | Dr. Art Hoernicke |
| 11:15 - 12:15 | Legal Implications of the Role of the Special Education Paraprofessional | Phyllis Kelly |
| 12:15 - 1:15 | LUNCH | |
| 1:15 - 3:15 | *MINI-WORKSHOPS: (The time frame for each is 30 minutes) | |
| | 1. First Aid/Medical Aspects | Lena Hermann |
| | 2. Behavior Management | Eunice Nelson |
| | 3. Characteristics of Exceptional Children | Jim Dyk |
| | 4. Methods & Materials for Special Education Programs | Fred Smokoski |
| | 5. The Paraprofessional in Institutional Settings | Phyllis Kelly & Debby Maxon |
| | 6. Learning Modes | Bill Boomer |

*Each topic will be presented 3 times.
*Choose 3 out of the 6 workshops you would like to attend.
*You will be able to participate in 3 mini-workshops.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 3:15 - 4:00 | Wrap-Up<br>"How to implement the information you've learned today!" | Phyllis Kelly & Mary Goff |
| | EVALUATION | |

Paraprofessional Conference of Kansas (P.C.K.)

## THE PARSONS REGIONAL PARAPROFESSIONAL WORKSHOP

Parsons State Hospital
Studio Room
U.A.F. Building

Friday, November 3, 1978

9:00 a.m. - 4:00 p.m.

## AGENDA

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 9:00 - 9:30 | Registration<br>Introductory Remarks | Mary Goff & Phyllis Kelly |
| 9:30 - 10:30 | Keynote<br>"The Emerging Role of the Special Education Paraprofessional" | Dr. Bill Boomer |
| 10:30 - 11:15 | P.L. 94-142, 504 regulations and the Role of the Special Education Paraprofessional | Nick Henry |
| 11:15 - 12:15 | Legal Implications of the Role of the Special Education Paraprofessional | Phyllis Kelly |
| 12:15 - 1:30 | LUNCH | |
| 1:30 - 3:00 | *MINI-WORKSHOPS: (The time frame for each is 30 minutes) | |
| | 1. First Aid/Medical Aspects | Ruth Steele |
| | 2. Behavior Management | Jackie Connely |
| | 3. Characteristics of Exceptional Children | Linda Ney |
| | 4. Methods & Materials for Special Education Programs | Shirley Lane & Sharon Reynolds |
| | 5. The Paraprofessional in Institutional Settings | Phyllis Kelly & Judy Cutsinger |
| | 6. Learning Modes | Dr. Bill Boomer |

*Each topic will be presented 3 times.
*Choose 3 out of the 6 workshops you would like to attend.
*You will be able to participate in 3 mini-workshops.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 3:00 - 4:00 | Wrap-Up<br>"How to implement the information you've learned today!" | Phyllis Kelly & Mary Goff |
| | EVALUATION | |

# APPENDIX B

## FACILITATOR LIST

Revised 1978-79

"OLD" DISTRICTS/PARAPROFESSIONAL FACILITATORS:

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | ATCHISON/JEFFERSON: | Janet Schmidt<br>604 Liberty<br>Oskaloosa, KS 66066 | (913) 863-2919 |
| 2. | COLBY: | Renee Kiger<br>Education Service Center<br>135 West 6th<br>Colby, KS 67701 | (913) 462-6781 |
| 3. | DODGE CITY: | Deana Scott<br>2316 Melencamp<br>Dodge City, KS 67801 | (316) 225-4932 |
| 4. | EL DORADO: | Diana Schuster<br>R. R. #2<br>El Dorado, KS 67042 | (316) 321-9491 |
| 5. | EMPORIA: | Diane Kramer<br>Box 459<br>216 West Sixth<br>Emporia, KS 66801 | (316) 343-2302 |
| 6. | EUREKA: | Joan Gryder<br>820 East First<br>Eureka, KS 67045 | (316) 583-6221 |
| 7. | FORT SCOTT: | Rex Woodrow<br>Fifth & Main<br>Fort Scott, KS 66701 | (316) 223-0800 |
| 8. | HAYS: | Dennis Scott<br>230 West 11th<br>Hays, KS 67601 | (913) 625-7321 |
| 9. | HAYSVILLE: | Joan Smokoski<br>1745 W. Grand<br>Haysville, KS 67060 | (316) 524-4282 |
| 10. | HIAWATHA: | Carol Nigus<br>First & Kickapoo<br>Hiawatha, KS 66434 | (913) 742-7108 |
| 11. | HUTCHINSON: | Susan Combs/Virginia Neufeldt<br>1203 W. 32nd<br>Hutchison, KS 67501 | (316) 663-1176 |
| 12. | IOLA: | Joe Chalker<br>402 East Jackson<br>Iola, KS 66749 | (316) 365-5171 |
| 13. | INDEPENDENCE: | Curt Schmitz<br>Box 668<br>220 East Chestnut<br>Independence, KS 67301 | (316) 331-6303 |

"Old" Districts/Paraprofessional Facilitators Cont........

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 14. | JUNCTION CITY: | Leo Anschutz<br>1120 West Eighth<br>Junction City, KS 66441 | (913) 238-6184 |
| 15. | KANSAS CITY: | Lowell Alexander<br>3043 State<br>Kansas City, KS 66102 | (913) 621-3073 |
| 16. | LARNED: | Stan Horyna<br>Tri-County Spec. Serv. Coop.<br>P. O. Box 196<br>Garfield, KS 67529 | (316) 569-2263 |
| 17. | LAWRENCE: | Bruce Passman<br>2017 Louisiana<br>Lawrence, KS 66044 | (913) 842-7394 |
| 18. | LEAVENWORTH: | Gerald Ascue<br>Seventh & Olive<br>Leavenworth, KS 66048 | (913) 682-5932 |
| 19. | LYONS: | Mildred Hicks/Honor Kepka<br>209 West Avenue South<br>Lyons, KS 67554 | (316) 257-5129 |
| 20. | McPHERSON: | John Wyckoff<br>301 West Kansas<br>McPherson, KS 67460 | (316) 241-1650 |
| 21. | MULVANE: | Frances Elliot<br>1214 Joann<br>Mulvane, KS 67110 | (316) 777-4191 |
| 22. | OLATHE: | Diane Melton<br>Box 2000<br>1005 Pitt Street<br>Olathe, KS 66061 | (913) 782-0584 |
| 23. | OTTAWA: | Jean Geist<br>403 S. Sycamore<br>Ottawa, KS 66067 | (913) 242-3237 |
| 24. | PHILLIPSBURG: | Dwayne Scott<br>TMR Center<br>Glade, KS 67639 | (913) 543-5824 |
| 25. | PRATT: | Ray Martin<br>301 South Jackson<br>Pratt, KS 67124 | (316) 672-2101 |
| 26. | ST. MARYS: | Patricia Flanagan<br>Box 160<br>St. Marys, KS 66536 | (913) 437-2319 |

"Old" Districts/Paraprofessional Facilitators Cont.......

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 27. | SALINA: | Marjorie Hargis<br>111 Colorado<br>Salina, KS 67401 | (913) 827-0301 |
| 28. | SEAMAN: | Vicki McNown<br>1124 W. Lyman Rd.<br>Topeka, KS 66608 | (913) 232-4143 |
| 29. | SHAWNEE MISSION: | Dr. Gerry Hahn<br>7342 Lowell<br>Shawnee Mission, KS 66204 | (913) 722-5220 |
| 30. | TOPEKA: | John Ganger<br>Administration Center<br>Topeka Public Schools<br>624 West 24th St.<br>Topeka, KS 66611 | (913) 272-1944 |
| 31. | WAMEGO: | Mike McKee<br>815 Fifth St.<br>Wamego, KS 66547 | (913) 456-9195 |
| 32. | NEW STRAWN: | Robert Scott/Ann Fritz<br>Three Lakes Spec. Serv. Coop.<br>Box 556<br>New Strawn, KS 66839 | (316) 364-5581 |
| 33. | WICHITA: | Fred Smokoski<br>649 North Emporia<br>Wichita, KS 67214 | (316) 268-7238 |
| 34. | WINFIELD: | Agnes Sherman<br>920 Millington<br>Winfield, KS 67156 | (316) 221-2860 |
| 35. | VALLEY CENTER: | Bob McClenahan<br>317 Pine Street<br>Goddard, KS 67052 | (316) 755-1241 |

"OLD" DISTRICT WITH NEW FACILITATORS:

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | ATCHISON (city): | Connie McCoy<br>Central School<br>215 North 8th St.<br>Atchison, KS 66002 | (913) 367-4385 |
| 2. | BELOIT: | Al Marten (Old Fac.)/Diana Doyle<br>Box 547<br>116 West Main<br>Beloit, KS 67420 | (913) 738-3261 |
| 3. | CLAY CENTER: | Linda Grote<br>807 Dexter<br>Clay Center, KS 67432 | (913) 632-3176 |
| 4. | DERBY: | Jane Billingsley<br>Box 175<br>Derby, KS 67037 | (316) 788-2877 |
| 5. | EUDORA: | Greg Gaither<br>East Central Ks. Coop. In Ed.<br>Box 621<br>Baldwin City, KS 66006 | (913) 594-6505 |
| 6. | GARDEN CITY: | Donna Knoll<br>211 Jones Ave.<br>Garden City, KS 67846 | (316) 275-9681 |
| 7. | GREAT BEND: | John H. Basham, Jr.<br>3500 Broadway<br>Great Bend, KS 67530 | (316) 792-2713 |
| 8. | HOLTON: | George Meeker<br>c/o S.E. Mobile<br>Fifth & Colorado<br>Holton, KS 66436 | (913) 364-3650 |
| 9. | HOWARD: | Lee Sprague<br>Box 43<br>Howard, KS 67349 | (316) 374-2113 |
| 10. | MANHATTAN: | Mary McIlzaine<br>2031 Poyntz<br>Manhattan, KS 66502 | (913) 537-2400 |
| 11. | NEWTON: | Mark Wilson<br>725 Main<br>Newton, KS 67114 | (316) 283-0908 |
| 12. | PAOLA: | Jo Rucker<br>Box 268<br>901 West Wea<br>Paola, KS 66071 | (913) 294-2303 |

"Old" District With New Facilitators:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 13. PITTSBURG: | Lorna Martin<br>Horace Mann School<br>1610 South Elm<br>Pittsburg, KS 66762 | (316) 231-3870 |
| 14. RUSSELL: | Bert Hitchcock<br>802 Main<br>Russell, KS 67665 | (913) 483-2173 |
| 15. TROY: | Don L. Nigus<br>Box 296<br>Troy, KS 66087 | (913) 985-2555 |
| 16. WASHBURN: | Gary Zabokrtsky<br>5928 S.W. 53rd<br>Topeka, KS 66610 | (913) 862-0419 |
| 17. WELLINGTON: | Allyn Anderson<br>1002 East Harvey<br>Wellington, KS 67152 | (316) 326-3841 |

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

NEW DISTRICTS JOINING THE FACILITATORS' MODEL:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. COLDWATER: | Mary Ann Jones<br>205 N. Chicago<br>Coldwater, KS 67029 | (316) 582-2580 |
| 2. CONCORDIA: | Ron Fielder<br>217 W. 7th<br>Concordia, KS 66901 | (913) 243-4527 |
| 3. PARSONS: | Dennis Hasson<br>Parsons State Hospital<br>3601 Gabriel<br>Parsons, KS 67357 | 8-566-3353 (KANSAN)<br>or (316) 421-6550 |
| 4. SHAWNEE HEIGHTS: | Gerald Robinson<br>Tecumseh North Elem. School<br>Tecumseh, KS 66542 | (913) 379-0553 |
| 5. SENECA: | Joan McKinley<br>709 Nemaha<br>Seneca, KS 66538 | (913) 336-2173 |

# APPENDIX C

## AGENDAS FROM FACILITATOR WORKSHOPS

## "NEW" FACILITATORS WORKSHOP

Ramada Inn Downtown — Friday, September 22, 1978
North & South Lower Lounges — 9:30 - 4:00

## AGENDA

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 9:30 - 10:00 | Registration & Coffee<br>Introduction | Mary Goff & Phyllis Kelly |
| 10:00 - 11:00 | Rules & Regulations Governing Special Education Paraprofessionals<br>The Facilitator Model | Phyllis Kelly |
| 11:00 - 12:15 | "The Paraprofessional: A Concept In Differentiated Staffing" | Dr. Bill Boomer |
| 12:15 - 1:45 | LUNCH | |
| | "Love of Job"<br>&<br>"How to be a Facilitator" | Mary Goff |
| | Wrap-Up & Evaluation | |

# FIRST FACILITATORS WORKSHOP

Thursday, November 9, 1978

Regency Room I

## AGENDA

| | |
|---|---|
| 1:00 - 1:30 | Registration |
| 1:30 - 3:00 | Keynote:<br>"Setting the Stage for Learning for Exceptional Students"<br>-- Dr. Richard Whelan |
| 3:00 - 3:15 | BREAK<br>Coffee/Cokes |
| 3:15 - 4:30 | Business Meeting<br>-- Mary Goff<br>-- Phyllis Kelly<br>-- Don Hardesty |
| 6:30 - 7:15 | Social<br>Hawaiian Room |
| 7:15 - ? | On Your Own |

# FIRST FACILITATORS WORKSHOP

## Friday, November 10, 1978

## AGENDA

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 8:30 - 9:00 | Coffee & Rolls | Regency Room I |
| 9:00 - 10:15 | "Is She For Real?!" | Regency Room I |
| | -- Vera Yager | |
| 10:15 - 10:30 | BREAK | |
| 10:30 - 12:00 | Mini-Workshops: | |
| | 1. Workshop Planning & Delivery of Inservice (1-1/2 hr.) | Kansas I |
| | -- Carolyn Rude-Parkins | |
| | *2. Behavior Management (45 min.) | Regency Room I |
| | -- Dr. Bill Boomer | |
| | *3. Methods & Materials for Paraprofessionals (45 min.) | Kansas II |
| | -- Ann Fritz | |
| 12:00 - 1:00 | LUNCH | Regency Room II |
| 1:00 - 2:30 | Mini Workshops: | |
| | 1. Workshop Planning & Delivery of Inservice (1-1/2 hr.) | Kansas I |
| | -- Carolyn Rude-Parkins | |
| | *2. Competencies for Paraprofessionals in SMH Programs (45 min.) | Kansas II |
| | -- Patsy Galligan | |
| | *3. Body Management (45 min.) | Regency Room I |
| | -- Vera Yager | |

*These workshops will be presented twice.

2:30 - 3:15 WRAP-UP AND EVALUATION -- Mary Goff & Phyllis Kelly

# SECOND FACILITATORS WORKSHOP

## Thursday, February 22

## AGENDA

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 9:00 - 10:00 | Registration<br>Coffee & Rolls | Gallery Room |
| 10:00 - 10:30 | Introductory Remarks | Gallery Room |
| 10:30 - 12:00 | Pre-Service/In-Service Training for Paraprofessionals | Gallery Room |
| | and | |
| | Administrative Concerns for Working with Special Education Paraprofessionals | |
| | -------JEPTHA GREER--------- | |
| 12:00 - 1:00 | LUNCH | Riviera Room |
| 1:00 - 2:30 | Utilizing Transactional Analysis Skills | Gallery Room |
| | ------PETER PACKARD & JOYCE MOODY------ | |
| 2:30 - 2:45 | BREAK | |
| 2:45 - 4:25 | MINI-SESSIONS | |
| (2:45 - 3:30) | on specific skills for paraprofessionals | |
| & | (repeated once 45 minutes each) | |
| (3:40 - 4:25) | (1) Transactional Analysis<br>---Peter Packard & Joyce Moody | Gallery Room |
| | (2) Characteristics of Exceptional Children for Students<br>---Dee Glazier | Palm Room |
| | (3) Behavior Management<br>---Renee Kiger | Drawing Room |
| | (4) Methods & Materials<br>---Donna Stewart | Terrace |
| 4:30 - 5:00 | Business Meeting | Gallery Room |
| | ----PHYLLIS KELLY & MARY (GOFF) McKEEVER----- | |
| 5:00 - 6:00 | ***SOCIAL HOUR*** (B.Y.O.B.) | Riviera Room |

# SECOND FACILITATORS WORKSHOP

## Friday, February 23

## AGENDA

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 8:30 - 9:00 | Coffee & Rolls | Gallery Room |
| 9:00 - 10:30 | New Paraprofessional Training Media & Materials<br>-------DR. DON HARDESTY------ | Gallery Room |
| 10:30 - 11:30 | "Evaluating Evaluation Components of the Paraprofessional Training Grant"<br>------DR. LARRY HAVLICEK------- | Gallery Room |
| 11:30 - 12:00 | WRAP UP & EVALUATION<br>------PHYLLIS KELLY & MARY (GOFF) McKEEVER | Gallery Room |

# APPENDIX D

## PARAPROFESSIONAL NEWSLETTERS

# SECOND FACILITATORS WORKSHOP

## Friday, February 23

## AGENDA

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 8:30 - 9:00 | Coffee & Rolls | Gallery Room |
| 9:00 - 10:30 | New Paraprofessional Training Media & Materials<br>-------DR. DON HARDESTY------ | Gallery Room |
| 10:30 - 11:30 | "Evaluating Evaluation Components of the Paraprofessional Training Grant"<br>------DR. LARRY HAVLICEK------- | Gallery Room |
| 11:30 - 12:00 | WRAP UP & EVALUATION<br>------PHYLLIS KELLY & MARY (GOFF) McKEEVER | Gallery Room |

# APPENDIX D

## PARAPROFESSIONAL NEWSLETTERS

# PARAPROFESSIONAL Newsletter

Vol. 1 No. 1 November, 1978

**Dear Paraprofessional:**

Hello! I hope you are having a good school year so far. This is the first of three newsletters that will be issued this school year.

The purpose of the newsletter is to provide a communication link among paraprofessionals and other personnel who share a very special place in the education of exceptional children.

We want to share information including ideas, materials, hints, methods, etc. In order to accomplish this and to have a truly representative endeavor, it is necessary for us to have the complete cooperation of *all* paraprofessionals. We need you to submit your ideas, concerns, and other pertinent information to us. Please do your part. You can send your contributions to the attention of Mary Goff, Assistant Director, Paraprofessional Training Grant, Kansas State Department of Education, 120 East 10th Street, Topeka, Kansas 66612.

I wish all of you a good year and I look forward to receiving information for inclusion in the newsletter.

*Mary Goff*

## GENERAL INFORMATION AND STATE-WIDE NEWS

*This is the spot for reporting state-wide Happenings of Interest and Value to Paraprofessionals.*

### Inservice Meetings and Workshops

### *Regional Paraprofessional Workshops*

This past summer a committee of paraprofessionals, a special education administrator, a special education teacher, a university special education director and State Department of Education personnel met twice to plan five (5) regional workshops for paraprofessionals. Loretta Gallagher, a paraprofessional from Shawnee Mission, was the chairperson for this group.

The committee chose "The Emerging Role of the Paraprofessional" as the theme for the workshops and picked the following dates and locations for these:

| | |
|---|---|
| *Topeka* | *September 23* |
| *Dodge City* | *October 12* |
| *Hays* | *October 13* |
| *Wichita* | *October 30* |
| *Parsons* | *November 3* |

The purpose and objectives of the workshops are as follows:

1. *To develop an increasing awareness of the professionalism of the paraprofessional in the total educational system.*
2. *To present an overview of P.L. 94-142 and the 504 regulations and the role of the special education paraprofessional in implementing provisions of these laws.*
3. *To discuss legal implications of the role of the special education paraprofessional.*
4. *To provide an opportunity for special education paraprofessionals to attend mini-workshop sessions on a variety of special education topics.*

To date, four of the five regional workshops have been held:

| Location | Attendance |
|---|---|
| *Topeka* | *150* |
| *Dodge City* | *75* |
| *Hays* | *75* |
| *Wichita* | *250* |

(Approximately 80 paraprofessionals are expected in Parsons.)

The reaction to the workshops has been most positive with paraprofessionals wanting more of this type of meeting.

To the persons who assisted to all levels in the planning and conducting of the workshops and to the paraprofessionals and other staff who were in attendance--a very warm thank you!

A workshop for deans of instruction from area community colleges, private colleges, and area vocational-technical schools was held on Thursday, September 21 at the Kansas State Department of Education. Twelve persons were in attendance. Competencies, training for paraprofessionals, background on the Facilitator Model and possible courses for paraprofessionals were discussed.

Twenty "new" facilitators attended a workshop on Friday, September 22, at the Ramada Inn Downtown, Topeka. The facilitators were trained on the roles and responsibilities of the paraprofessional, the facilitator model, aspects involved in their role as facilitator. We welcome these "new" facilitators!

The first workshop of the year for all facilitators will be held on Thursday, November 9 (half-day), and Friday, November 10, at the Holidome in Hutchinson, Kansas. The workshop will focus on the training of specific skills for paraprofessionals. Some of the skill topics to be presented are: managing the learning environment, body management, skills in working with severely multiply handicapped students, methods and materials and workshop organization.

### *WINFIELD STATE HOSPITAL*

Thirteen paraprofessionals from the Serendipity Special Purpose School (Winfield State Hospital & Training Center) visited Rainbow United and the Institute of Logopedics in Wichita, the Cedarview School for Trainable Mentally Retarded, the MR/DD sheltered workshops, and Educable M/R programs in Winfield on October 5-6, while the teachers were attending the Kansas State Department of Education workshop in Topeka.

Thirteen paraprofessionals plan to attend the workshop in Wichita, October 30. Inservice on wheelchair positioning, emergency aid for choking, and a session on self-feeding have been completed during the past month. A week of inservice led by Jack Jarrett, school principal, was completed September 1st.

*Dr. Earl Dungan*

### *HIGH PLAINS SPECIAL EDUCATION COOPERATIVE*

On August 23, 1978, the paraprofessionals from High Plains Special Education Cooperative met for the H.P.S.E.C. orientation session. In the afternoon, during the group discussions, the paraprofessionals had the opportunity to meet one another and to discuss the roles and responsibilities of the paraprofessional. The meeting was concluded by the group singing the following to the tune of Three Blind Mice.

Paraprofessionals
Paraprofessionals
See how we aid
See how we aid
We help the teacher to serve every kid
We go find Johnny whereever he did
We wonder why Susie did what she did
Paraprofessionals

---

I am a paraprofessional working in the program for severely-multiply handicapped children. For some of our children, an important part of our daily program involves tactile stimulation. So often these children are "wrapped in bunting" so to speak, and are not aware of or do not react well to the many feeling sensations of the world. We feel that if we can get these kids to not draw away or cry at the different sensations - rough, smooth, soft, hard, warm, cold, etc. - we've accomplished a great deal.

We also work with the physical therapist in motor exercises with the children, to help some walk and others to just keep their muscles from drawing up.

If any of you are ever in the Salina area, we invite you to stop by the Special Education Center and visit us.

Elsie Challans
Paraprofessional S.M.H.
Special Education Center
Salina, Kansas

## KANSAS STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION NEWS

### The Special Education Paraprofessional Approval Process

As many of you already are aware, an Approval Process for Paraprofessionals has been on the drawing board for the past three years. The requirements and level of permits were formulated by a teacher aide committee composed of State Department personnel, paraprofessionals and other persons interested in paraprofessionals. This plan was adopted by the Professional Teaching Standards Board in September, 1977, and went to the State Board of Education in February, 1978. Since that time, much discussion has occurred relative to this Approval Process. Changes were made in the original proposal and the State Board of Education on October 10, 1978, adopted the following inservice requirements and permit levels. We anticipate this system to be in full operation by fall of next year. At the present time, guidelines are being formulated and the permits are being printed to distribute to the local school districts for distribution. The local districts and cooperatives will be responsible for placing each paraprofessional on the proper permit level and distributing the permits to the paraprofessionals. Further information will be forthcoming in your next issues of the newsletter.

The following are the Approval Process requirements:

**Program Approval**

Paraprofessional programs will vary depending upon local needs, sources and amount of funding, and availability of personnel. It is strongly recommended that a local education agency plan very carefully before initiating a paraprofessional program. Such factors as recruitment, selection, placement, and training are matters for which planning needs to be done and policies established before paraprofessionals are employed. Program approval, supervision, and monitoring will be based on the following:

(1) Names and assignments of paraprofessional personnel and the name of the special education professional(s) that the paraprofessional is assigned to shall be included as part of the approval forms utilized by the Special Education Administration Section.

(2) The paraprofessional shall be under the supervision of an approved special educational professional(s).

(3) Special Education paraprofessionals employed as of September 15 will be reimbursed at the rate of one-half the full-time teaching equivalency. Any approved personnel employed after September 15 will be reimbursed at a rate equal to the proportion of the number of complete months employed to the full school year (nine months).

(4) The paraprofessional in direct education service programs shall be involved in duties and activities which relate to the role of an *instructional paraprofessional.*

(5) School officials are encouraged to seek paraprofessional employees with at least a high school diploma. Experience and individual competence, however, should be given the highest priority. Paraprofessionals in the following program areas will require specific skills and levels of training: school psychology and school social work.

(6) Individual programs with specific cases may be referred for individual approval to the Special Education Administration Section.

### Individual Paraprofessional Approval

An approval process for special education paraprofessionals was approved by the Professional Teaching Standards Board in September, 1977, and received by the State Board of Education in February, 1978. The State Board stipulated that the approval process shall be included as part of the Special Education Paraprofessional Section of this Plan.

### In-Service Program Standards

Each local education agency shall be required to file with the Special Education Administration Section, Kansas State Department of Education, a plan for in-service training for special education instructional paraprofessionals. At the conclusion of the school year, a report shall be filed, verifying the activities that occurred during that academic year.

The following components shall be included as part of the in-service training program:

In-service training specifically related to the area and type of program in which the special education instructional paraprofessional is employed shall be provided. The training should include, but not be limited to, four sessions during the school year for a total of at least 20 in-service clock hours.

An orientation session shall be included as one of the four sessions. These sessions should include topics, such as role expectations, duties and responsibilities, relationship of paraprofessionals to the total school environment, salaries and fringe benefits, and policies, rules, and regulations of the local education agency.

Participation in state or regional workshops designed for the instructional paraprofessional and other related local or state workshops can be included as part of the local education agency's in-service training program.

### Standards And Requirements For Permits

Each special education instructional paraprofessional shall be required to possess one of the following permits to work in a special education program or service in an accredited school.

PARAPROFESSIONAL I PERMIT: This is the only required level a paraprofessional must obtain. The requirements are —

(1) Participation in at least four in-service sessions offered by the local education agency, Kansas State Department of Education, and/or agency or professional organization totaling at least 20 clock hours of in-service training per school year.

The local education agency may choose to substitute all or part of the above requirements with an equivalent amount of appropriate college coursework taken during the school year.

Paraprofessionals, new to the local education agency, shall receive a Paraprofessional I Permit after participation in an in-service orientation session and upon guarantee by the local education agency that the paraprofessional shall meet the requirement as stated above for Paraprofessional I Permit.

PARAPROFESSIONAL II PERMIT: The requirements are —

(1) two years experience as an instructional paraprofessional;

(2) a completion of 30 semester college hours of approved academic work, or an equivalence of 450 clock hours of approved in-service training; or a combination of each of the two totaling 450 clock hours.

The permit should be reissued every three years.

PARAPROFESSIONAL III PERMIT: The requirements are —

(1) three years experience as an instructional paraprofessional;

(2) a completion of 60 semester college hours of approved academic work, or an Associate Degree from an approved training program for instructional paraprofessionals, a certificate from an approved training program for instructional paraprofessionals from a vocational technical school, an equivalence of 900 clock hours of approved in-service training, or a combination of each of the four totaling 900 clock hours.

The permit should be reissued every three years.

In order to advance to a higher level, a paraprofessional shall verify successful completion of the requirements stipulated under each previous permit.

### Entry Level Placement for Credentialed Personnel

The superintendent, special education director, or other designated staff may decide what level permit a credentialed person may obtain upon entry into the school system as a special education instructional paraprofessional. The experience criteria may be waived for these individuals.

**Administrative Procedures***

(1) Appropriate forms (including permits) will be developed for reporting and monitoring purposes.

(2) Procedures will be developed for implementing the *approval process.*

* These forms and procedures will be developed by the Special Education Administration Section.

---

The Kansas State Department of Education, in June, received a three year grant for the development of training for paraprofessionals. Phyllis Kelly and Mary Goff are coordinators of the grant.

There are currently three slide tapes regarding the training of special education paraprofessionals available for loan at the Kansas State Department of Education, Special Education Administration Office. The titles of these are as follows:

*The Facilitator Model*

*Roles & Responsibilities of Paraprofessionals*

*The Role of the Paraprofessional in the Implementation of P.L. 94-142*

If you would like to borrow any of these for an inservice meeting, please contact *Mary Goff or Dianna Rausch at 913-296-3867.*

## *STATISTICS FY 79 PARAPROFESSIONAL UNIT AS OF OCTOBER 1978 UPDATE*

| | |
|---|---|
| (EMR) SEMI-INDEPENDENT | 241 |
| (TMR) SEMI-DEPENDENT | 167 |
| DEPENDENT RETARDED | 2 |
| TOTALLY DEPENDENT | 0 |
| LEARNING DISABLED | 215 |
| HEARING IMPAIRED | 31 |
| PHYSICALLY IMPAIRED | 30 |
| GIFTED | 25 |
| PSA (EMO. DIS.) | 135 |
| VISION | 23 |
| SEVERELY-MULTI HANDICAPPED | 76 |
| NON-CATEGORICAL | 1 |
| INTER-RELATED | 110 |
| DEAF-BLIND | 0 |
| PSYCHOLOGY | 4 |
| SOCIAL WORK | 21 |
| SPEECH-LANGUAGE | 26 |
| SEIMC | 41 |
| SPECIAL EDUC. ADMINISTRATION | 2 |
| (H & H) HOMEBOUND | 3 |
| OTHER | 20 |
| STATE TOTALS | 1173 |

## *PERSONALITIES IN SPECIAL EDUCATION*

Here we spotlight those people of interest to paraprofessionals. This time we feature Dianna Rausch, Secretary on the Paraprofessional Grant. Dianna is from Hoyt, Kansas, and is one of twelve children. Dianna graduated from Royal Valley High School and Clark School of Business with a major in Executive Secretary. Dianna is interested in sewing, crafts, and sports.

Dianna is enjoying her work on the paraprofessional grant which includes workshop planning and implementing as well as secretarial skills. We welcome Dianna!

## *TIPS ON METHODS AND MATERIALS*

*GAME:*

### KNOW YOUR CONTRACTIONS

Materials: 8 x 11 Ditto
Tokens
List of words

Divide 8 x 11 into 12 sections similar to a Bingo Card:

| Know | Your | Bingo |
|---|---|---|
| don't | we're | you're |
| it's | won't | I've |
| you've | can't | wouldn't |

List of Words:

do not,
we are,
you are,
I have
can not,
etc....

To Play:

Leader calls out two words that are used to make one contraction. Student covers that contraction with token. When student gets three in a row across, up & down, or across. To collect reward of point, token, free-time, etc., he/she must call back the contraction *and* the two words this contraction represents.

*Bonnie Kramer, Paraprofessional in EMH III & IV of the Atchison-Jefferson Ed. Coop, McLouth High School*

## *PROGRAMMING IDEA*

TIME

1. Divide the day into small blocks on time. Fifteen to 20 minutes may be about right for many children. As the children begin work more and more productively the time can be lengthened.

Name ______________________ Date __________

9:00 - 9:20 ____________________________

9:20 - 9:40 ____________________________

9:40 - 10:00 ____________________________

10:00 - 10:20 ____________________________

10:20 - 10:40 ____________________________

10:40 - 11:00 ____________________________

2. Provide a written daily schedule. The schedule will help the child to see in advance what is expected of him. The schedule can either be organized into time blocks or by subject.

Name ______________________ Date __________

Arithmetic ____________________________

Reading ____________________________

Language ____________________________

Art ____________________________

Handwriting ____________________________

Spelling ____________________________

For children who don't read and can't tell time, a color code can be used. The first color corresponds with the first activity, the second color with the second activity, and so on. In this way, the child gains greater independence.

The daily schedule also provides an excellent record of individual activities which can be later shared with the parents.

Dr. Bill Boomer
Fort Hays State University

## *RECOMMENDED READING*

Highly recommend the book, *Normalization*, by Wolf Wolfenebuger, would appreciate hearing comments from those who read it.

*Dr. Earl Dungan, Serendipity School*
*Winfield State Hospital*
*Winfield, Kansas 67156*

For light reading written on a juvenile level but very interesting - *A Boy Called Hopeless* - A novel by David Melton.

*Kay Menhusen*
*IRC paraprofessional*
*Level I & II*
*Anthony, Kansas*

# PARAPROFESSIONAL Newsletter

February, 1979

Vol. 2 No. 2

Dear Paraprofessional:

The Kansas snow is still with us and it is time for this, the second issue, of our Paraprofessional Newsletter for the school year 1978-79.

I am including in this issue all reports received up to the present time. I wish to thank the following people for their interest and for the material they have submitted:

Betty Albee and Gladys Gall, Paraprofessionals - Brown County Kansas Special Education Cooperative, Hiawatha, Kansas

Katherine Pommier, Paraprofessional - Roosevelt Junior High, Pittsburg, Kansas

Marilee Erbert, Paraprofessional - Jardine Junior High, Wichita, Kansas

Bonnie Kramer, Paraprofessional - Atchison-Jefferson Special Education Cooperative, Oskaloosa, Kansas

Patsy Galligan, Outreach Specialist & Coordinator of Deaf-Blind & Severely Multiply Handicapped Programs - Kansas State Department of Education/Special Education Administration, Topeka, Kansas

Dr. Bill Boomer, Special Education Department - Fort Hays State College, Hays, Kansas

The third and final issue of the newsletter will be printed and disseminated in May, so please send in any articles that you would like to have included in the May issue.

Thank you,

*Mary C. McKeever*
*Assistant Director,*
*Special Education Paraprofessional Training Program*

## GENERAL INFORMATION AND STATEWIDE NEWS

*This is the spot for reporting Statewide Happenings of Interest and Value to Paraprofessionals.*

### IN-SERVICE MEETINGS AND WORKSHOPS

### *Facilitators Workshop*

The first workshop of the year for all facilitators was held on Thursday, November 9, and Friday, November 10, at the Holidome in Hutchinson, Kansas. The workshop focused on the training of specific skills for paraprofessionals. The keynote presentation on "Learning Environments for Exceptional Students" was given by Dr. Richard Whelan, University of Kansas Medical Center. Vera Yager from Tucson, Arizona, presented on skills appropriate for all paraprofessionals and also did a session on "Body Management". Carolyn Rude-Parkins from the University of Iowa conducted a mini-workshop on "Workshop Planning and Delivery of Inservice". Two additional mini-workshops on "Behavior Management" and "Methods & Materials for Paraprofessionals" by Dr. Bill Boomer, Fort Hays State University and Ann Fritz, Eskridge were presented. A business meeting on paraprofessional grant activities was also conducted by Mary McKeever, Phyllis Kelly, and Dr. Don Hardesty.

A group of "performers", "The FACILITATORS", entertained Holidome guests by singing a top 40 hit entitled "Paraprofessionals", the tune of which sounded like that old time favorite "Three Blind Mice". It was most enjoyable. Members of "The Facilitators" are: Gerry Hahn, Steve Mosler, Greg Gaither, John McFarland, and Lowell Alexander. Rumor has it that the group will be performing in Wichita during the month of February.

* * * * * *

The second workshop for all facilitators is scheduled to be held on Thursday, February 22 (full day) and Friday, February 23 (half-day) at the Holiday Inn Plaza, Wichita.

The focus of the workshop will again be geared to specific skills for paraprofessionals working in special education programs. One of our main speakers will be Jeptha Greer, Assistant Superintendent for Supporting Programs, from Avondale Estates, Georgia. His topic will center around administrative components for working with special education paraprofessionals. Mr. Greer wrote an article entitled "Utilizing Paraprofessionals and Volunteers in Special Education" that was published in the November, 1978, *Focus On Exceptional Children.*

Peter Packard and Joyce Moody, MSW's, of Private Practice of Transactional Analysis Groups in Topeka, will be presentors also. They will be speaking on transactional analysis and how teachers and paraprofessionals can actively utilize these skills in working with children.

In addition, a session on new training media and materials developed for the paraprofessional training grant will be presented by Dr. Don Hardesty as well as a session on the evaluation components of the grant by Dr. Larry Havlicek, University of Kansas.

## *BROWN COUNTY KANSAS SPECIAL EDUCATION COOPERATIVE*

In our room we have nine students ages 14 to 21, one teacher and two paraprofessionals. Our work program is a big success. One paraprofessional has taken three students to clean the Pizza Hut every morning for three and one half years. The teacher takes three students to clean the Country Squire Motel, and the other paraprofessional takes three students to clean apartments and houses here in Hiawatha. Hiawatha is very cooperative in hiring these boys and girls. The students deposit their money from these jobs, and we are teaching them to write checks. They use this money to go bowling, for Winter Olympics, etc.

We are fortunate to have a big classroom with a kitchen and laundry facility. The students do laundry for the SMH room. They also plan menus, shop for groceries, and are learning different departments in the grocery store, and cooking. Three students write an invitation and invite a guest for lunch.

Academics include telling time, counting money, general information, survival words, reading, and calculator. Data sheets are kept on these subjects, which show if the students' grades are going up or down. In P.E. they enjoy square dancing.

A grooming checklist makes looking neat and clean fun. We are teaching them to wash their hair step by step.

The behavior modification program is working in our room. In September the students covered Pringle cans with wallpaper and now carry them throughout the day. For good behavior and work they receive play money. At the end of the day graphs are recorded on behavior. They want to see the graphs go up rather than down. They go to the room bank and the amount is recorded in a book, and they can go shopping in the store in our room and can buy items they want or save for something more expensive. These are discarded items from homes.

Paraprofessionals
Betty Albee
Gladys Gall

## *SOUTHEAST KANSAS SPECIAL EDUCATION COOPERATIVE*

At the beginning of last school year, Mrs. Sharon Willover, a Level III E.M.H. teacher, decided it would be fun to have a class project which involved every student. When I heard of this my first thought was that it was insane to even think about such a project, but as time went on I realized it was very sane and very much fun.

The class formed a company, Willover and Co., and chose two boys to be in charge of banking the money they hoped to raise. They sold stationery, baked and decorated cakes for a raffle, held candy sales, manned a concession stand for a speech-debate tournament, cleaned McDonald's parking lot and had bake sales to raise enough money to go to World's of Fun at Kansas City.

Each child also had a personal savings account for their extra spending money while in K.C. By saving all their change they had from $5.00 to $15.00 in each account. The students earned a total of $453.50.

The big day finally came in April. We boarded a bus at 7:00 a.m. for our destination. Eighteen students and six adults made the trip, all expenses paid, by their hard work and determination. We left the park at 5:00 p.m. and had dinner at the Washington Street Station, once again their hard work paid the bill. They still have enough money left for a skating party.

We returned home at 9:00 p.m. tired but very happy about a very rewarding day.

It really wasn't an insane idea. It was very fun and we'd gladly do it again.

Katherine Pommier
Paraprofessional for
Sharon Willover
Level III E.M.H.
U.S.D #250
Roosevelt Jr. High
Pittsburg, KS.

## STATEWIDE CONFERENCE for PARAPROFESSIONALS

*"Paraprofessionals: A Look To The Future"*

The Paraprofessional Planning Committee--a committee of paraprofessionals, a special education administrator, a special education teacher, a university special education director, and State Department personnel who planned the five regional workshops for paraprofessionals held this past Fall--have met twice to plan for a Statewide Conference for Paraprofessionals. The above is the title the Committee has chosen for the conference which is to be held on ***FRIDAY, MARCH 30*** (full day) and ***SATURDAY, MARCH 31*** (half-day) at the ***RAMADA INN DOWNTOWN, TOPEKA***.

This Conference is a first. There has never been a Statewide Conference for Paraprofessionals in Kansas that focused solely on the interests, needs, and training concerns of paraprofessionals. The Committee is very excited about the conference and would like to see as many paraprofessionals as possible attend. The March 30 date is the date of the K-NEA meeting and most districts have the day off from school.

Several persons from Kansas will be conducting mini-sessions at the Conference. In addition, the following individuals from around the country will be presenting:

Richard White, Keynote Speaker
Project ASSIST
Indiana University
Ann Lou Pickett
New Careers Training Lab

New York City, New York

Vera Yager
Tucson Public Schools
Tucson, Arizona

Mary-Beth Fafard
University of Wisconsin
Milwaukee, Wisconsin

George Kaplan
Institute of Educational Leadership
Washington, D.C.

The Committee has worked very hard to plan this very special conference and they are most hopeful that as many paraprofessionals as possible will attend and help make this first Statewide Conference a success.

Paraprofessionals are asked to bring any special ideas and/or materials they have made or used in their special education programs that they would like to share with other paraprofessionals. These will be displayed during the first day of the Conference for viewing. The display will be monitored by paraprofessionals on the Planning Committee. Paraprofessionals are asked to label any materials they might bring with their name and school district and to bring the materials to the Conference between *8:30 and 9:30 on Friday.*

It will be necessary to pre-register for the Conference. The registration fee is $5.50 and includes lunch. *Checks should be made payable to the* Atchison-Jefferson Special Education Cooperative and mailed to Mary (Goff) McKeever at the address listed below.

Sleeping room reservations at the *Ramada Inn Downtown, Topeka* can be made by calling the following *toll-free* number: 1-800-432-2424. Please tell the reservations clerk that you are with the Paraprofessional Conference group as rooms have been set aside for us.

Additional information on the Conference will be available by the end of February through your paraprofessional facilitator. If you need further information regarding the conference, please contact

Mary (Goff) McKeever or Dianna Rausch
Kansas State Department of Education
Special Education Administration Office
(913) 296-3867

Hope to see all of you then!!

The following is a list of the Paraprofessional Planning Committee Members:

Al Marten - Beloit
Loretta Gallagher - Shawnee Mission
Dorothea Eikenberry - Topeka
Cathy McCaffrey - Topeka
Ronda Showalter - Eskridge
Donna Pettay - St. Marys
Nancy Preble - St. Marys
Saundra Simkins - St. Marys
Gladys Gall - Hiawatha
Liz Deppe - Leavenworth
Nita Phillips - Lansing
Renee Kiger - Colby
Betty Zak - Shawnee Mission
Janet Hosty - Shawnee Mission
Roberta Dewitt - Overland Park
Molly Taylor - Shawnee Mission
Carol Thomas - Overland Park
Dr. Boomer - Hays
Diana Schuster - El Dorado
Mary (Goff) McKeever - KSDE, Topeka
Phyllis Kelly - KSDE, Topeka

## SMH INFORMATION

A number of paraprofessionals across the state have requested information on resources and materials for the SMH population. We are extremely fortunate in this state to have access to a wealth of information and resources to draw from. You need not feel like you are fighting the battle alone! The following is a list of resources you may draw from:

### *State Level*

Phyllis Kelly is the Coordinator of SMH and Deaf/Blind programs for the state. Patsy Galligan is the Outreach Specialist for the SMH and Deaf/Blind programs. Both are very willing to answer any questions and address problems and concerns you may have. They can put you in contact with a number of individuals who are very competent in the area and assist you in receiving technical assistance if desired. They both can be reached at:

Special Education Administration
120 E. 10th
Topeka, KS. 66612
(913) 296-3866

### *Newsletter*

A new component this year is a statewide SMH newsletter. The second newsletter is in press now. The Special Education Directors and SMH teachers should have copies. You are most welcome to contribute to the newsletter any ideas, concerns or requests. This newsletter is edited by the Kansas State Department of Education. Contact Phyllis Kelly or Patsy Galligan at the above address for contributions or requests.

### *University Level*

We are fortunate in the state of Kansas to have one of the few training programs in the nation in the SMH area. The program is located at the University of Kansas. Dr. Doug Guess and Dr. Steve Lyon are the professors. A unique component of the program is the Statewide Inservice Project for Teachers of the Severely Multiply Handicapped. Ms. Jennifer Holvoet is the project director. Many of the teachers across the state are enrolled in this program. The trainers visit the classroom site to supervise practicums and monitor progress of the course work which is designed in a selfpaced module format. Any paraprofessional interested in obtaining SMH certification should contact

Dr. Doug Guess
University of Kansas
Department of Special Education
Haworth Hall
Lawrence, KS. 66045

### *Organization*

The American Association for the Education of the Severely and Profoundly Handicapped is a young, rapidly growing, national organization specifically for personnel working in the area. Yearly dues include a monthly newsletter, quarterly journal and an opportunity to attend the yearly convention held in October. For more information write to:

AAESPH
1600 West Armory Way
Garden View Suite
Seattle, WA. 98119

### *Local Level*

On the local level, a wealth of resources are available to you. If your program does not have a physical therapist, occupational therapist or speech and language specialist, the local hospitals and nursing homes may. These people could give you programming ideas or help with a particular problem. Doctors and nurses may be willing to address general medical concerns you may have. The physical education, music, and art teachers should be able to help you adapt activities which would make instruction in these areas more meaningful for your students.

## PERSONALITIES IN SPECIAL EDUCATION

*Here we spotlight those people of interest to paraprofessionals.*

When I go to meetings, a lot of the conversation is complaints about the teachers they work with. I would like to toot my horn for the best EMH Teachers around. At Jardine Junior High School in Wichita, Kansas, you will find Athalene McNay, Mary Smith, and John Black.

Mrs. McNay, Mrs. Smith, and Mr. Black along with our Principal Cleofas Muci implemented a program unique to junior high schools. No longer are our students in self-contained annexes or classrooms. We have all classrooms inside the building and our students pass from class to class like regular students. They feel better about themselves, getting to pass like everyone else. Therefore there seems to be less labeling "EMH" or "retarded" by the other students.

This is my third year and each year we get more students. This year we are at capacity, 45 students in EMH. Also this year we have added one LD room and a GTC room which I'm sorry to say are in annexes because of the late decision to add them.

The teachers are also involved with the student body as a whole. Mrs. McNay has Campus Life Club. Mrs. Smith is our Cheerleader and Pom Pom Sponsor. Mr. Black has an "I Can" Club. Mr. Polifka, our new LD teacher, has the Pep Club, and Mrs. Wherritt, our new GTC teacher, has a Drama Club.

Pamela Hall and I are the two Paraprofessionals for the three EMH teachers. We also rotate from class to class. To some this might seem confusing but we like it.

Even though I am older and less educated than the teachers and the other Para, they never make me feel out of place in any conversation. However they do ask my opinion about different things.

It really is educational, and a pleasure to work with teachers such as these, and to have a concerned and understanding principal.

Now that I've tooted my horn it's time to get back to work.

Marilee Erbert
Paraprofessional II
USD #259

## A DAY IN THE LIFE OF A PARAPROFESSIONAL

Have you ever wondered what a day is like in a Special Education Classroom? Have you ever visited one?

As you may know the state of Kansas now makes it mandatory for our schools to offer a free education to all children of our state. This includes all categories of handicapped children, ranging all the way from Severely Multiply Handicapped (S.M.H.), through Learning Disability (LD) to Trainable Mentally Handicapped (T.M.H.) on to Educatable Mentally Handicapped and even the Gifted. Also included are the Visually Handicapped and Hearing Impaired students.

I think it is truly wonderful that our state has determined that everyone is entitled to a complete education. Our country, over two hundred years ago, was founded on the Constitution of the United States. That Constitution clearly states that all are entitled to a free public education. Thank God our state realizes that this means everyone, not just the so-called "normal".

Now come along with me, and we can visit an EMH III & IV (Junior High and Senior High) classroom at McLouth, Kansas.

This is where I work as a Paraprofessional. Perhaps before we visit the class, I should tell you a little bit about what a Paraprofessional is, and what I do. A Paraprofessional is "one who works beside the Professional", in other words, alongside the Special Education Teacher.

My duties vary widely and may change from day to day, or week to week. I am asked to perform such simple tasks as making phone calls, operating the mimeograph machine, typing up reports, or even running errands. Other times I may be expected to conduct the class for awhile, freeing the teacher to do other things demanded of her outside the classroom. Somedays my greatest achievement may simply be lending a sympathetic ear, while a lonely student pours out their personal woes to me.

No day is ever exactly like the day before; constantly changing, each day is a new challenge. Flexibility is the key in working successfully in an EMH classroom.

My day begins at 8:00 a.m. when I report to our second-story classroom. I mention the fact that it is located two stories up, because that fact is ever prevalent in my mind. I usually travel these stairs at least five times a day; and it would be no exaggeration if I said that on some days I have made that trip eight or nine times.

On my arrival, I usually have some filing to do, and almost always at least one ditto to run on the mimeograph. So down the stairs I go, to the teacher's lounge, where the machine is located.

On my way down, I may be detained by the Home Ec teacher, asking me about the girls who will be reporting to her for sewing today. She may be wanting me to come along with them to help her get them started on their latest project. She could be wanting to ask me about a future cooking project we have planned; for this she will need to schedule her cooking classes so that the kitchen will be free for our use.

Our first class beings at 8:21 a.m.; at this time I usually work with one boy, listening to him read aloud. This leads him to build up confidence in himself and his reading skills. If for some reason he is not here, then I shift to help another student working with money. During this exercise, he works with simulated money; counting it, making change, and a general over-all practice of it uses.

The Shuttle-Bus arrives at 8:45 a.m., bringing us other students from the surrounding districts. It is time now for me to take one group of students to another classroom; this alleviates some of the overcrowding we are beginning to feel. With this group we work on a Work Preparation Workbook. This is provided to help them plan what type of employment they wish to seek in the future, and how to prepare for it.

It is now 9:15 a.m., the bell rings, but that doesn't mean any rest, only a change of class and a new group of students.

Second hour is fairly quiet; we have only four students. I work with two girls; they are each working at their own speed and level on reading and writing skills. Helping them to understand their instructions and then assisting them in the completion of these assignments is what I plan to do this period. But today isn't going so well; one girl doesn't want to settle down; she requires much coaxing to get her mind on her work. The other one has been angry since she arrived at school, and refuses to even open her book. Finally, after quite a long time, she decides to get started and actually seems to enjoy the exercise.

Now we begin third hour; again we have a fairly small group. Today we discuss walking four blocks to the local bank to have the interest registered in our savings account book. We take a vote; everyone agrees it is a good idea, so away we go. It is only 9° out today, but everyone seems to welcome the change, and an opportunity to get away from the structured classroom. When we return from our outing, it is difficult for everyone to get back in the mood for studying. This is a good opportunity to spend a few minutes cleaning our room. It does have a tendency to become rather cluttered at times.

The ringing bell signals the end of the hour, and the beginning of my 23 minute lunch break. I am always grateful for these few minutes for myself. I find it pleasant to find a quiet spot in the teacher's lounge, and spend a few minutes reading for my own pleasure. There is usually just enough time for a cup of coffee, a sandwich, and a short conversation with another faculty member. Then I am once again climbing those stairs back up to room #309.

The Junior High students are now joining us for the remainder of the day. Thus far they have been mainstreamed into the regular curriculum, for the morning classes.

It is a handwriting exercise that starts their daily program. After they have finished this task, they begin their spelling.

At this time, the High School students and teacher leave for their lunch break.

Now we spend approximately twenty minutes reading our latest selection of an adventure story. Sometimes this is more than a little difficult, as it is not always easy for them to sit still, for this length of time. If this is the case, we simply switch to a word-game or maybe a math contest, at the blackboard. This always seems to go over well, and prompts co-operation from everyone.

At the conclusion of fourth hour, we are once again joined by the teacher and High School students. This fifth hour class is our largest of the whole day, and perhaps our most hectic.

Math is assigned to each student at his or her own speed and level. Somedays everyone works diligently and makes great strides toward the completion of his and her own work. Other days nothing seems to click for anyone, and regardless of the assistance offered by the teacher or myself, no one seems to accomplish much of anything. This math hour is usually either a near-disaster or a complete success. The room is small, consequently the students are crowded. Oftentimes bickering begins as the irritations mount; other times spurts of giggling seem to errupt spontaneously. Either reaction can be disruptive to the whole class.

Our sixth hour class follows, and to look around you might think the overcrowding is just as prevalent as fifth hour had been; you are absolutely correct. This hour is devoted entirely to reading and language skills;

and again each student is working at his or her own speed and level.

During this period we try to get to each and every student and give each a chance for oral reading. This gives them a chance to feel a sense of accomplishment: and the teacher an opportunity to analyze how well they are progressing. Half-way through the hour, the teacher, along with a group of students with comparable skills move to another room. These students read and discuss a novel they have chosen to share. At this time, I am left in charge of the remainder of the class. Sometimes we ask the more advanced readers to assist the other students with their reading assignments. This technique can be a morale booster for the advanced student; by using it, my time is free to give individual attention to a student who definitely needs it.

Finally we are approaching the seventh and final hour for the day. Seventh hour finds our class fairly small and very short. The students number approximately seven; some days more, some days less. This is due to the fact that absenteeism runs high in our classroom. Also, two of our seniors attend a Nurse's Aide Preparation class at Oskaloosa on alternating afternoons.

This hour is spent studying Social Studies; it seems to have made the students more aware of their world and environment.

At 2:35 p.m. the Shuttle Bus arrives to transport the bus students back to their home districts. The local students are dispersed to a study hall; giving the teacher a much needed planning period to end her day.

After sharing information I have gathered during the day, with the teacher, I am ready to head for home.

It has been a busy day, as you can see; so it is everyday. I have neglected to include any unforseen incidents such as, a fire drill, as assembly, a black eye, a sick child, a visit from someone's pet snake, a tornado drill or an outburst of absolute defiance; and these incidents have all been present in our classroom at one time or another.

I hope your visit to our classroom has been informative and interesting. I realize not everyone can be as enthused with the Special Education Program as I am, but I certainly hope it is here to stay. These students truly deserve it, for each one of them is a Special Person.

## TIPS ON METHODS AND MATERIALS

*T. C. BEAR*

Materials:

1. Large cut-out of a bear to be attached to wall.
2. Supply of different colors of construction paper scraps.
3. Copy of poem to be printed on bear.

Use:

1. Children may either read poem or have it read to them.
2. They choose scraps of construction paper and paste them onto bear to form features and clothing.

Poem:

Fuzzy Wuzzy was a bear.
Fuzzy Wuzzy had no hair.
So Fuzzy wasn't fuzzy, was he?

Choose some brown or choose some white,
Or add some black to make him right.

A touch of red or a touch of pink
Will make his mouth & ears, I think.

So do your best with all the rest,
And when it's done, he'll be all dressed.

### Something New In A Lunchbox*

No, not something to eat . . . Bright yellow, sturdy, child-size lunchboxes are the containers for SRA's new manuscript of cursive handwriting non-consumable practice kits. Each kit contains 48 exercise cards, 10 heavy plastic overlays (the exercise cards are inserted in these), 10 markers (crayons can also be used), a pad of 40 pupil progress sheets, and a teacher's manual.

The SRA Lunchbox handwriting practice kits provide materials for the trace-to-learn approach. Learners can use these independently and the exercises are self-checking. The materials may be used repeatedly since the overlays are easily cleaned with a tissue.

The SRA Lunchbox handwriting kits are well designed and simple to use. There are arrows by the letter forms to encourage directionality and accuracy. The letters are used in words as well as presented as single symbols.

Although the publisher designates the kits as 'primary,' there are no grade-level or maturity-level implications in the materials themselves. The materials may be used with learners of all ages.

The SRA Lunchbox Handwriting Kits, published in 1977 by Science Research Associates, cost $49.50.

### All About A Lovable Monster*

Monster's name is Monster and he does all the normal things that monsters do . . . like riding on a bus, cleaning his house, having a party, visiting the zoo, going to a museum, and things like that. And, his interesting experiences are told in Spanish too.

The Monster sound filmstrips are adapted from the Monster books created and written by Ellen Blance and Ann Cook. These delightful fantasy stories are favorites of young children.

The Monster filmstrips series are composed of three sets—each set contains four filmstrips. The narrator is an excellent storyteller and the music and sound effects help listeners to interpret the actions and feelings of the story events. The cassettes and/or records present the narration and effects on side one, and one side two the story is read. Side two without the filmstrips can be used as a read-along exercise with the Monster book of the same title. The Monster sound filmstrip sets, first released in 1975, are produced by Bowmar.

*Taken from *Frankly Speaking*, National Information Center for Special Education Materials, University of Southern California, Volume 1, No. 1, March, 1978.

## PROGRAMMING IDEA

### Classroom Management Ideas from Dr. Bill Boomer Fort Hays State University

### SPACE

1. When the child comes into the room, have him pick up his written daily schedule. The schedule will tell him which activity area to go to. His materials should be ready so that he can start to work. This avoids the problem of having the child stand around waiting to be told where to go and what to do.
2. Break the room into activity areas. For example, in a self-contained elementary room, you may want to have a science center, a listening center for tapes and records, an art center, a game and free-time area, and a quiet area. In addition, if a child is unable to work productively at one activity, he can be moved to another area where he may find more success.
3. When the child finishes an assignment, have him place it in an in-basket to be checked. He can then go to the free-time activity area until the next scheduled activity begins.
4. Provide a quiet area for reading and thinking. Creative teachers have used refrigerator cartons, old bathtubs, and small areas formed by bookshelves and file cabinets. You can monitor this area to insure that productive work goes on.
5. Provide a game and free-time activity area. When a child finishes his assignment he can go to the free-time activity area until the next scheduled activity begins. In this way he doesn't disturb other children who are still working, and he isn't confused by being able to both play and work at his desk.

### CLASS ASSIGNMENTS

1. Don't give the child all of his assignments at once. Instead, give him one assignment at a time. In this way the child will not be overwhelmed or confused about which assignment to start on first. Furthermore, he can experience success each time he finishes an assignment.
2. Give short assignments that the child can complete in 15-20 minutes. This will give the child many opportunities for success throughout the day. As the year goes on and the child works more and more productively, longer assignments can be given.
3. Make sure that the child finishes one assignment before starting a new assignment. Check his work immediately so that you will know that each assignment is completed.
4. Structure free-time activities. Free time which is "totally" free can undo a good program. You may need to help a child choose a game, book, magazine, puzzle, or other activity.
5. Make sure the child knows exactly what to do. Trouble usually starts when the child doesn't know how to begin an assignment. On the other hand, when a child is working productively with many successes, classroom management problems are minimal.
6. At the beginning of the school year, don't give homework. As a child begins to work productively in class, you may want to start giving homework. But don't give homework to a child who can't even work in class. Give homework to those children who have shown you that they can work independently in class.

# PARAPROFESSIONAL Newsletter

May, 1979

Vol. 2 No. 3

**Dear Paraprofessional:**

This will be the final issue of our Paraprofessional Newsletter for the school year 1978-79.

We wish to thank the following people for their contributions made to this issue of the newsletter: -

Diana Schuster, Facilitator, Butler County
Betty Montgomery, Paraprofessional, Flint Hills Coop.
Dorothy Wright, Paraprofessional, Brown County
Bonnie Kramer, Paraprofessional, Atchison-Jefferson Coop.
Shirley Clark, Paraprofessional, Tecumseh North
Betty May, Paraprofessional, Kansas School for the Deaf, Olathe, KS.
Pat Ayres, Paraprofessional, Kansas School for the Deaf, Olathe, KS.
Betty Janeski, Paraprofessional, U.S.D. 501, Topeka, KS.
Kathy Koca, Paraprofessional, U.S.D. 501, Topeka, KS.
James Marshall, State Director Special Education, K.S.D.E., Topeka, KS.

It has been a good year, highlighted by our First Statewide Conference for Paraprofessionals. We hope that the next year will bring even greater accomplishments for the paraprofessional movement.

We wish everyone a pleasant summer. Why not use some of the time available during these next few months to send in any ideas and comments which you may not have had time to forward to us before? Send any materials you might like to contribute to the attention of Mary McKeever at the State Department of Education, 120 E. 10th St., Topeka, Kansas 66612. Your efforts will be greatly appreciated!

## GENERAL INFORMATION AND STATEWIDE NEWS

*This is the spot for reporting Statewide Happenings of Interest and Value to Paraprofessionals.*

### Paraprofessional Workshops for 1979-80 School Year

*Paraprofessional Planning Committee for Paraprofessional Conferences*

We would like to again next year continue to have regional workshops and/or a statewide conference for paraprofessionals. As mentioned at the Statewide Conference held in Topeka on March 30th & 31st, our Paraprofessional Planning Committee will be meeting this summer to discuss and develop plans for the workshops that will be held next year. If you would also like to serve on this committee, please contact Phyllis Kelly or Mary McKeever at 913-296-3866 by *June 1, 1979.* Any expenses, including mileage, will be paid. There will most likely only be two meetings this summer. We would like as many interested paraprofessionals as possible to participate.

Mary McKeever & Phyllis Kelly

## STATEWIDE CONFERENCE FOR PARAPROFESSIONALS

The first statewide conference for Paraprofessionals was held on Friday and Saturday, March 30 & 31 at the Ramada Inn in Topeka, Kansas. The meeting was attended by over 300 paraprofessionals from all parts of the state. Several interested and energetic persons came from as far away as Atwood, Colby, Anthony, etc.

The theme of the conference was "Paraprofessional: A Look to the Future". The objectives covered seven areas as follows:

1. To explore the overall role of the Special Education Paraprofessional --Past, Present, & Future.
2. To examine the role of the paraprofessional from a national perspective.
3. To look at the total Role of the Paraprofessional as an Educational Team Member.
4. To look at Training Considerations for Paraprofessionals.
5. To present information on specific Special Education Categorical Areas regarding characteristics, methods, and elementary/secondary level considerations.
6. To present specific skills for paraprofessionals appropriate to the special education program they are assigned to.
7. To provide a time for paraprofessionals to meet informally with keynote presentors and other paraprofessionals from Kansas.

The meeting on Friday started at 8:30 a.m. with registration. Introductions & notes were made by Phyllis Kelly & Mary McKeever, the Director and Assistant Director of the Paraprofessional Training Program of the Kansas State Department of Education. Speeches made on Friday morning included those of Mr. James Marshall, Director of Special Education Administration, K.S.D.E.; Loretta Gallagher, Paraprofessional, Shawnee Mission, Anna Lou Pickett, Director of the BEH Paraprofessional Project, New Careers Training Laboratory, N.Y.C.; Richard White, Project ASSIST, Indiana University, and George Kaplan of the Institute for Educational Leadership. The luncheon speaker was Dr. Lyman Boomer of Fort Hays State University. The afternoon session was devoted to mini-sessions on Special Education Categorical Areas, and four workshops. These workshops covered the following skills for paraprofessionals. "Administrative Concerns; Transactional Analysis Skills; Career Ladders, and Behavior Management.

The Saturday morning meeting consisted of a message on "The Paraprofessional & CEC" given by Rusty Welch, Assistant Executive Director, Unit Development Division of the Council for Exceptional Children. Mr. Welch explained CEC objectives and was interested in paraprofessional feelings towards a paraprofessional membership unit of CEC.

The Saturday session also included a report by Phyllis Kelly and Mary McKeever on Kansas Paraprofessional news, and was concluded by a panel discussion and evaluation by several of the featured speakers during the conference. (We have included a listing of the featured speakers in our "Personalities in Special Education" section of this newsletter. These people are the most informed and enthusiastic advocates of the paraprofessional movement. Their speeches were inspiring and knowledgable as well as very entertaining. They deserve all our special thanks for their efforts on our behalf.)

Those paraprofessionals who attended this conference unanimously agreed that it was a most informative and worthwhile endeavor. We all learned that through the efforts of Phyllis Kelly and Mary McKeever, Kansas has become a leader in the paraprofessional field. We would urge all paraprofessionals to strongly express their thanks and support to Phyllis & Mary.

Submitted by Betty Janeski &
Kathryn Koca, Topeka, Kansas

***The following are additional comments on the Statewide Paraprofessional Conference:***

The conference was held in Topeka. In the large group sessions we heard several guest speakers. The main theme of these speakers was the importance of our job as a co-worker with our teachers. As a co-worker you become the right hand and sometimes the left hand of the teachers you work with, even if the job you are doing seems small, for it helps give the teacher the extra time she needs in class. As these speakers were talking, many of the things they were saying I would relate to from practical experiences. For instance, as a teacher is teaching I have had the "job" of helping one or two students keep their attention on the teacher.

I also attended three mini-workshops: 1) Learning Disabilities. In this workshop the overall idea was more meaningful to me than the structural methods being demonstrated. This main objective is one to keep foremost in our minds. Find the best way to teach the individual child and not only teach him through this method, but make sure the child knows how he learns the best. For example, if the child learns best by writing things on paper, use this form of teaching and make sure he learns this is the easiest way for him to learn. He will have to adapt his learning method for the rest of his life.

2) The second workshop was Behavior Management. In this workshop many aspects of behavior management, which includes control and change, were covered. The main idea was to know each child. By paying attention to the child closely, many times you can prevent problems. Another idea stressed was to be consistent and make sure the child knows what is expected of him. Most children work well when they know what the rules are and what the punishments are for breaking the rules. The less that is left up in the air, the less frustrations for teacher, paraprofessional, and child.

3) The last mini-workshop was Transactional Analysis. In this workshop the "ego" states were discussed. As the workshop went on I could again relate many things said to some of the experiences I've had with some of our kids. The main idea I feel to keep in mind was the idea of giving good strokes to the child whenever you can.

In the large group sessions Saturday morning we heard a presentation from a representative from C.E.C. (Council for Exceptional Children). We also discussed the permits for the paraprofessionals. These permits will be distributed next fall. We also talked about getting our in-service hours for our permits.

I feel the workshop was well worth going to. I enjoyed meeting other people who are working with special kids as I do. I also liked sitting down and having a presentation given that related specifically to what I am doing. I think that we teacher's aides - "paraprofessionals" - are a breed of our own. We are not certified teachers, but we are not "helpers" from the senior class either. Luckily at Kansas School for the Deaf. I feel all of our teachers know the worth of a "paraprofessional" which makes my job most enjoyable and most worthwhile.

Pat Ayres
Kansas School for the Deaf
Olathe, Kansas

The trip to Topeka to the first statewide conference for Paraprofessionals, March 30 and 31, 1979, was a very interesting and informative time. There appears to be many, many people who need the help of the paraprofessional. There were 326 people (men and women), the youngest - 18, the oldest - 63, who met for this conference.

Our beginning session consisted of several very good speakers, namely: Richard White of Indiana University and Dr. Boomer from Hays State College. They all valued the many hours their aides or paraprofessionals spent working with them and their students.

This name, paraprofessional, was repeated, repeated, and repeated to instill in us that our position as an aide is very important to the lead teacher. It was suggested many times that teachers also need instruction on how to work with paraprofessionals.

Several workshops were available to us. We were assigned the workshop which we had designated on our registration slip. One of my selections was Learning Disabilities, in which a teacher demonstrated several techniques used to teach spelling. One way was Visual, he sees the word, Visual Verbal, student spells aloud, Visual Motor, then writes the word, Visual Verbal, sees the word, spells the word aloud, writes the word.

Another workshop was the Transactional Analysis skill workshop for paraprofessionals. This type of workshop could not be covered in this short time to my thinking. More time was needed to get across what they were saying. This would be a course I might consider if a class were offered at Johnson County Community College.

In explaining the Career Ladders, our speaker came from the University of Milwaukee. She was a very good speaker. I could see that a career ladder would work for many people if they wanted to continue their education and go on to college. I would not do that at this time in my life.

There were many questions asked of the directors and presentors - of course, the salary was discussed, but at this time they weren't concerned with the salary prospect. To have a certified paraprofessional, a piece of paper saying so to this effect, is top priority. To have them trained properly is the biggest goal. Too many aides go into this service with no training. They feel that to be more effective, more training should be offered in the local Junior Colleges in the particular special education category. To date, there doesn't seem to be much available for Deaf Education.

Also, there was felt a need to meet with all other paraprofessionals informally and with keynote presentors from over Kansas.

I thoroughly enjoyed the experience and was glad our administrator felt it would be worth our while to attend. If, in the future, another one is held, I would consider going.

Another presentation was given by Rusty Welch, Assistant Executive Director, Unit Development Division of the Council for Exceptional Children. I'm not familiar with the C.E.C. and perhaps some information might be forthcoming as to whether it would be advantageous to participate in this organization as paraprofessionals in Deaf Education.

Betty May
Kansas State School for the Deaf
Olathe, Kansas

## GENERAL INFORMATION AND STATEWIDE NEWS

The Butler County Special Education Paraprofessionals held a six hour in-service workshop conducted by Darlene Bruner, the Butler County Instructional Materials Center Coordinator.

The workshop was designed to acquaint the paras with the materials available to them in the IMC and enabled them to learn where materials were located that would be useful to them in their subsequent teaching.

A "Scavenger Hunt" proved to be an unique and adventuresome training technique. Given a list of materials to find, participants were "turned loose" in the Center to search. The opportunity to find things for themselves was found to be most helpful, and the method stimulated enthusiasm for the rest of the session.

Darlene also divided the participants into small groups and taught them how to use the machines in the Center, such as the laminator, thermofax, and how to make their own filmstrips.

We would like to share this idea for a workshop in your districts as it proved to be an excellent opportunity to learn about a very important part of the Special Education Program.

Diana Schuster
Facilitator
Butler County,
School Board Council
El Dorado, Kansas

## *LIFE AS A PARAPROFESSIONAL? YOU BET!*

Early last fall, I walked into a classroom - a little shaky, a little "green", - but with hopes and expectations for the coming year. With that year rapidly progressing toward the final quarter, I can say I am no longer shaky, no longer "green", and with expectations for the job certainly fulfilled.

I wanted to work in education. I wanted to work with children and experience the joy of seeing them learn. With college training in education, and having worked with students a number of years teaching piano, I knew that any job I embarked upon full-time had to have that rewarding element involved in some form of education - preferably with one-to-one contact with children. The job of a paraprofessional certainly "fills the bill." While I am not the one primarily responsible for the education of these very special children in our classroom, I can contribute to and am involved with their learning.

What is a paraprofessional anyway? A paraprofessional is just what the name implies - an off-shoot of, or someone along side of a teacher, specifically in the field of Special Education. She is there to help lighten the load of the teacher in any way she can, and perhaps even take over if necessity should require. The very nature of Special Education requires that an assistant perhaps be a little more involved with the students than an aide ordinarily would be. She should, in fact, be able to do anything the teacher does, except prepare the lesson plans. This, in turn, requires some extra training supplied by the State in the form of meetings and workshops. But my training has not stopped there. I have been extremely lucky, I feel, in working with a teacher for whom I have the utmost admiration. In observing her methods, one can readily see why she was selected in 1975 as one of the Kansas Master Teachers of The Year. What more could a paraprofessional ask for than to have this example?

But exactly what are the duties of a paraprofessional? Well, this past year I have:

- assisted with individual work with the students in reading, spelling, and math.
- run the copy machines.
- worked with one certain group of students daily in their own classroom at math time.
- typed (.. and typed) forms, letters, handouts for teachers, work for individual students, etc.
- drawn or constructed creatures and characters used as educational aids and behavior modifications.
- climbed a stepladder (to hang a constantly growing monster on our wall and ceiling!)
- played basketball, football - in fact, any active sport for a short period daily with one student.
- played educational games with the students.
- prepared the room in the morning.
- straightened the room after school.
- constructed bulletin boards.
- graded papers.
- played the guitar.
- wielded a paintbrush.
- laughed with the students.
- pulled hard for them.
- ....and yes, due to the extremely hard winter and bad roads, the situation did arise when I had to be the one in charge.

Does all this sound interesting to you? Do you like lots of variety in a job? Would you like to work with children who need that extra bit of guidance or motivation to get them going, and then, after all the struggle (.. and it *can* be one for them) experience the thrill of seeing that spark of recognition in their eyes when, yes .... they do understand! If you would answer yes to these questions, then perhaps you can see why I say - Life as a Paraprofessional? ..... You Bet!

Betty L. Montgomery
Paraprofessional
Washington School
Council Grove, Kansas

## *MY FIRST YEAR AS A PARAPROFESSIONAL*

This has been my first year as a paraprofessional and I want to share it with you. I have a lovely teacher to work with. This has a lot to do with the fact that I enjoy my work. I have never "dreaded" a day going to work with Miss Daniels and the 16 EMR II children.

I found it didn't take long to take a personal interest in each one of the children. I has been very rewarding to see some of the children "Blossom" - to know that I had a part in helping that child progress. There have been days when I wondered if I accomplished anything, but then, in a matter of time I see the fruits of my efforts.

My duties have been varied, which makes being a Para so great! Each day is a "surprise" as no two days go the same. Miss Daniel and I have a general schedule which is, and has to be, flexible.

The children have work to do around the school. In the winter they clean the bleachers that get dirty from the ball games. In the fall and spring they keep the playground and school yard clean. They have other routine work to do in the classroom and in the building.

Their curriculum includes phonics, math, reading, spelling, independent studies, home economics, art, music, and P.E. We have also included cooking treats in the classroom, learning about themselves and others, concepts of how to react to others and how to assess their own reactions to problems.

All in all it has been an informative year which I have truly enjoyed.

I just attended the first state Paraprofessional meeting here in Kansas. I thought it was tremendous to have several people from other states speak. I came home being glad I am a Special Education Para in Kansas and the Brown County Special Education Coop.

Dorothy Wright
Paraprofessional, EMR II
Brown County Special Ed. Coop

## TIPS ON METHODS AND MATERIALS

***Here we include any ideas, hints, recommendation which would be helpful for you to know.***

### *A Yucca Tree*

One again we will welcome spring with a Yucca Tree in our classroom. This tree consists only of a trunk and bare limbs. The leaves are added by the students - one each day. On the back of the leaves are riddles we have saved from our magazines throughout the year. One student is selected each day to choose a leaf (these are made of colored construction paper). This student reads the riddle to the class and gives everyone a chance to guess the answer. After reading the answer the student places the new leaf on the tree.

At the end of the year, we have a tree covered with leaves and memories of fun shared by all.

Example — How do you keep a fish from smelling?
Answer — cut off his nose
Yuk! Yuk! (thus the name Yucca Tree)

Bonnie D. Kramer
Paraprofessional EMH III-IV
McLouth High School
Atchison-Jefferson Educational Coop
Oskaloosa, Kansas

### *Stars and Checks Charting*

We have a reward system in our P.S.A. classroom. We use play money which we made ourselves. We use a money stamp on construction paper: pennies are green, nickels-yellow, dimes-red, quarters-white, 50¢-blue.

The teacher and I both have a chart. The child earns stars and checks. A star counts as one cent, checks are nothing. We both check throughout the day, average at the end of the day. We've found this helpful. The child knows he's being watched always - its always possible to earn stars.

Our chart has the following things on it:

In-Out Quietly
Following Directions
Working Quietly
Respect Others
Cooperate
Attitude

At the end of the day, they go to our store. The store has such things as: peanuts, raisins, candy, toys, puzzles, etc. They can decide to put a bigger item such as a model car or comb on "lay away." They must pay half of their money on their lay-away item in order to hold it.

When a child isn't working, we ignore that child and say the names of those getting a star. The one not working starts to work usually. Or tell one not working "I can't star you that way." They like stars - stars are for good workers. Once they start getting success with their work, they discover learning is fun and they're more eager to try.

Shirley R. Clark
2821 Shawnee Dr.
Topeka, Kansas 66605
District No. 450
Tecumseh North
PSA Paraprofessional

### *Let Them Know You Care*

The P.S.A. child has a lack of confidence in himself. He hasn't had much success in the classroom. He needs to know he's liked even though he can't work as other children do. One way I've found to do this is by winking. Let the child know a wink means "I like you." If he hasn't done well but knows you like him anyway, he won't give up.

A lot of discipline problems with other children are caused because of lack of self-love. Let them know you care.

Shirley R. Clark
2821 Shawnee Drive
Topeka, Kansas 66605
P.S.A Paraprofessional
Tecumseh North
District No. 450

### *PHONETIC DOMINOS*

1. Prepare 40 domino cards (1" x 2")
2. Choose 10 letters of alphabet and write a letter on one half of each card.
3. On the other place a picture that begins with any of the ten chosen letters.
4. If there are four "B" letter cards, there should be four "B" picture cards.
5. Match letters and pictures according to initial sound.

### *JUMBLED WORDS*

1. Prepare a set of cards with pictures and words (letters in mixed order)
2. Child uses picture clue to determine correct word and sounds out letter order.
3. If covered with contact paper, words can be correctly written with washable marker.

### *THERMOMETER*

1. Paint half of an 18" white shoelace red.
2. Make thermometer out of cardboard 9" long. Draw on degree graduations. Cut one slit the width of the shoestring at the top of the thermometer; cut a similar slit at the bottom.
3. Draw the shoestring through the two slits so the ends are on the backside of the cardboard. Knot shoestring ends.
4. Move shoestring up and down degree scale so that the point where the white and red colors meet corresponds with the present temperature.

### *COLORED SAND*

1. Mix powdered paint with a fine quality white sand on large sheets of newspaper. Place colored sand in bowls.
2. Let children squeeze out designs with white glue on construction paper.
3. Sprinkle colored sand on glue designs as you would glitter.
4. Pour excess sand back into its bowl.

### *WIND TUNNEL BALLOON*

Materials:

1. Heavy weight plastic available at hardware stores and lumber yards.
2. Plastic tape

3. Electric fan
4. Old quilt/cushions/spread - to protect plastic "floor"

Construction:

1. 4 strips of plastic about 10 ft. long and 4 ft. wide are taped together to form a tube.
2. 2 pieces 4 ft. by 2 ft. 6 in. are taped, overlapping slightly, leaving an opening for entry at one end.
3. A 4 x 4 piece of plastic is taped to close the other end of the tube. An opening is made in this to tape on a smaller tube of plastic.
4. This smaller tube is made about 3 ft. long and the right size to be taped to the front of the electric fan.

Use:

1. When fan is turned on, air inflates the balloon and children can enter through the slit in the end opposite the fan.
2. An old quilt or some similar material protects the "floor" and children should remove shoes before entering.
3. Films may be shown on the outside of the plastic and viewed by those sitting inside. It may also be used for story-telling groups, *etc.*

## *DON'T TELL ME THE FACTS, IT'S HOW I FEEL THAT COUNTS*

Developing understanding of self and others is a big challenge for every child in the process of growing up. Individuals with exceptional needs have been more hurdles. The DUSO Kits (Developing Understanding of Self and Others), produced by American Guidance Service for primary and middle grade children in regular classrooms, are also fine materials for Special Education classrooms since the materials are designed to stimulate social and emotional development.

The DUSO kits consist of metal storage/carrying cases and two large spiral bound story books (10" x 12") to be used as lap easels during storytelling.

There are 41 different stories with 200 full-color illustrations and 33 full-color posters (15" x 19"), each illustrating main points in one of the stories. A set of hand puppets is an integral part of the kit. Duso the Dolphin and Flopsie the Flounder are central characters throughout the program. All 41 stories are recorded and may be ordered on cassette or record. An excellent teacher's manual presents specific guidelines and supplementary activities.

The DUSO kits of activities and materials are designed to facilitate each child's understanding and positive valuing of himself, his understanding of the feelings of others and his ability to talk more freely about feelings, goals and behavior. The DUSO activities make extensive use of listening, inquiry and discussion approaches to learning. The complete DUSO Kit costs about $120.00, but each component of the kit may be purchased separately.

Taken from:
"Frankly Speaking"
NICSEM,
Vol. 1 No. 1, March, 1978

## PERSONALITIES IN SPECIAL EDUCATION

***Here we spotlight those people of interest to paraprofessionals:***

Included in this section are the following people who were the featured speakers at the first statewide Conference for Paraprofessionals held in Topeka on March 30 and 31.

Loretta Gallagher - Tomahawk Elementary School
6301 W. 78th
Overland Park, Kansas 66204

Loretta has been a paraprofessional for many years in the Shawnee Mission school district. She is a hard worker for paraprofessional recognition. She presented the paraprofessional viewpoint at the Kansas state meetings on the approval process which has since been adopted by the state. All paraprofessionals owe Loretta a special thank-you for speaking out on our behalf.

---

Anna Lou Pickett - CASE: New Careers Training Lab.
33 West 42nd Street
New York, NY 10036

Ms. Pickett has been involved in the publication of several manuals covering many facets of paraprofessional statistics, utilization and training. Anna Lou's office serves as a clearinghouse for national paraprofessional information. Anna Lou has been very instrumental in bringing together persons from around the country who are advocates for paraprofessionals.

---

Mary-Beth Fafard, Assistant Professor, School of Education
University of Wisconsin
P.O. Box 4130
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53201

Ms. Fafard is to be especially thanked for her excellent last-minute appearance at the conference as a result of the inability of another speaker to attend. She presented a very informed and energetic section on Career Ladders for Paraprofessionals. She has also been involved in paraprofessional research and publication of material on the paraprofessional movement and the training of paraprofessionals.

---

Richard White, Coordinator, Project ASSIST
Indiana University
Developmental Training Center
2853 East Tenth Street
Bloomington, In. 47401

Richard has co-authored the ASSIST Materials which are training materials for paraprofessionals and their supervising teachers. Mr. White's keynote speech was one which was enjoyed by all those in attendance. His thoughts from a former teacher's point of view and his research and training experiences were inspiring to hear. We would surely encourage a repeat performance at any of our future meetings.

---

George Kaplan, Institute for Educational Leadership
1001 Connecticut Ave., N.W. Suite 310
Washington, D.C. 20036

Mr. Kaplan has travelled widely over the entire country consulting those involved in the paraprofessional field and has written a book, ***The Vital Link,*** on these experiences. Perhaps he has visited your classroom. He is certainly a very informed specialist on paraprofessionalism.

---

Rusty Welch, Asst. Executive Director
Unit Development
CEC Headquarters
1920 Association Drive
Reston, VA. 22091

Mr. Welch conducted a written survey on paraprofessional feelings in relation to CEC at our statewide conference. The Council for Exceptional Children is interested in determining the details for a possible paraprofessional membership category in the CEC.

Submitted by:

Betty Janeski & Kathy Koca
Topeka, Kansas

## RECOMMENDED READING

## WELCOME SPEECH
### First Statewide Paraprofessional Conference
### 3-30 & 3-31
### Topeka, Kansas

W Is for *WWK*, or Who's Who in Kansas
I'll not keep you guessing,
It is you - Paraprofessionals -
Your contributions - a blessing!

E Is for *ESEA*, the Elementary/Secondary Education Act
It put paras on the map,
After all, with a huge federal grant
You can take quite a lot of bureaucratic crap.

L Is for *LRE*, a Least Restrictive Environment
Was it environment or was it a setting?
Oh well, who could care less
When some child is wetting?

C Is for *CPPH*, Comprehensive Program Planning for the Handicapped
Where agencies and trainers are getting together —
(maybe a rumor),
For more details
Contact State Chairman, Dr. Bill Boomer.

0 Is for *OCR*, the Office of Civil Rights
With nearest office in Kansas City,
They want assurances to be met
And not offer just pity.

M Is for *MH* or the Multiply Handicapped
Many children you meet are *severe*,
There may be deficits of speech, motor,
of intellect, of eye, and of ear.

E Is for *ERA*, the Equal Rights Amendment
Equal rights for all — a theme of this convention,
However, there are too many issues here
for me to try to mention.

So I'll change it to E --
E is for "EM" -- Aunty EM (that is) of Legendary Oz
After all a Kansas Tornado is much more exciting
Than federal laws.

And now with no further adieu,
Here are some representative descriptors of you.

***P*** Means you are ***positive.***

***A*** Means you are ***active.***

***R*** Is for ***ready***
You're a mighty good bunch,
And your work is quite steady.

***A*** Is for ***aggressive.***

***P*** You are perceptive, and

R Is for ***reliable*** . . .
You will try many, many procedures,
Especially if they seem half-way viable.

***O*** You are ***obliging.***

***F*** You are ***fantastic.***

***E*** You're ***essential*** . . .
You feel some days are ***so*** long,
But their end is eventual.

***S*** You're ***sincere.***

***S*** For ***sensational.***

***I*** Is for ***ideal*** . . .
To hell with textbook theories,
Your world is real.

***O*** Is ***optomistic.***

***N*** Is ***nurturing.***

***A*** Is ***altruistic.***

*L* Last but not least there is *love* ...
Come to think of it, you're not one
You are *all* of the above.

*S* Finally you are *serendiptious* . . .
You will find untold pleasures and values not sought
A great job you are doing,
For caring cannot be bought.

No put them altogether, and we have
*WELCOME PARAPROFESSIONALS.*

You didn't have "Mother"
Not even "Mother Mary' or Mother Phyllis"
But on with the Convention,
Or ... those two slave drivers will surely kill us!

James Marshall
State Director
Special Education Administration
Kansas State Department of Education
Topeka, Kansas

# APPENDIX E

## AGENDA FROM WORKSHOP FOR DEANS OF INSTRUCTION AND DIRECTORS OF EDUCATION FROM COMMUNITY COLLEGES, AREA VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL SCHOOLS AND PRIVATE COLLEGES

# WORKSHOP FOR DEANS OF INSTRUCTION AND DIRECTORS OF EDUCATION FROM COMMUNITY COLLEGES, AREA VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL SCHOOLS AND PRIVATE COLLEGES

## AGENDA

| | |
|---|---|
| Kansas State Department of Education | Thursday, September 21, 1978 |
| North & South Board Rooms | 9:30 a.m. - 3:15 p.m. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 9:30 - 10:00 | Registration<br>Introductory Remarks | Mary Goff &<br>Phyllis Kelly |
| 10:00 - 11:00 | Rules & Regulations Governing Special Education Paraprofessionals<br>The Facilitator Model | Phyllis Kelly |
| 11:00 - 12:15 | "The Paraprofessional: A Concept In Differentiated Staffing" | Dr. Bill Boomer |
| 12:15 - 1:45 | LUNCH | |
| 1:45 - 2:45 | Competencies & Courses for the Special Education Paraprofessional | Dr. Michael Davis |
| 2:45 - 3:15 | Wrap-Up<br>"Where Do We Go From Here?" | <br>Mary Goff |
| | Evaluation | |

# APPENDIX F

## AGENDA FROM STATEWIDE PARAPROFESSIONAL WORKSHOP

# "PARAPROFESSIONAL: A LOOK TO THE FUTURE"

## THE FIRST STATEWIDE CONFERENCE FOR PARAPROFESSIONALS

Downtown Ramada Inn
Topeka, Kansas

Friday, March 30, 1979
8:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.

## AGENDA

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 8:30 - 10:00 | Registration<br>Coffee and Rolls | Regency West |
| 10:00 - 10:10 | Introductions | Phyllis Kelly,<br>Education Program Specialist |
| 10:10 - 10:20 | Welcome Address | Mr. James Marshall,<br>Director, Division of Special Education Administration |
| 10:20 - 10:30 | "A Special Message" | Loretta Callagher,<br>Paraprofessional,<br>Shawnee Mission, Kansas |
| 10:30 - 10:40 | "Housekeeping Notes" | Mary McKeever,<br>Assistant Director,<br>Paraprofessional Training Program |
| 10:40 - 11:00 | "The State of the Art" | Regency West<br>Anna Lou Pickett,<br>Director, BEH Paraprofessional Project |
| 11:00 - 12:00 | Keynote Speech | Richard White,<br>Coordinator, Project ASSIST<br>Indiana University |
| 12:00 - 12:30 | "Reality & The Vital Link" | George Kaplan,<br>Specialist at the Institute for Educational Leadership |
| 12:30 - 1:30 | LUNCH | Grand Ballroom |
| | Luncheon Speaker | Vera Yager,<br>Paraprofessional Coordinator,<br>Tucson Public Schools |

(CONTINUED ON FOLLOWING PAGE)

1:30 - 2:30 MINI-SESSIONS (Special Education Categorical Area you signed up for)

| | |
|---|---|
| Trainable Mentally Retarded | Regency West I<br>Bunny Blankinship, SMH/Deaf-Blind/TMH Coordinator Topeka Education Center |
| Educable Mentally Retarded | Exhibit Arena I<br>Adrian Apel, EMH Coordinator Topeka Public Schools |
| Learning Disabilities | Regency West II<br>Dr. Bill Boomer, Coordinator/Special Education Fort Hays State University |
| Severely Multiply Handicapped/ Deaf-Blind | Exhibit Arena II<br>Patsy Galligan, Outreach Specialist and Coordinator of Deaf-Blind and SMH Programs, Kansas State Dept. of Education |
| Visually Impaired | Exhibit Arena III<br>Harold Hodges, Program Approval and Compliance Kansas State Dept. of Education |
| Hearing Impaired | Exhibit Arena III<br>Melvin Bruntzel, Specialist--Language, Speech, & Hearing Kansas State Dept. of Education |
| Personal & Social Adjustment | Exhibit Arena III<br>Renee Kiger, PSA Consultant, N.W. Kansas Educational Coop. Colby, Kansas |
| Early Childhood | Exhibit Arena IV<br>Dr. Lucy Paden, Early Childhood State Liaison Kansas State Dept. of Education |
| Gifted | Exhibit Arena IV<br>Diane Wright, Gifted Education Coordinator Topeka Public Schools |
| Physically Impaired | Exhibit Arena IV<br>Konny Rosette, Teacher, and Lynette Wright, Teacher, Capper Foundation, Topeka, Kansas |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 2:45 - 3:45 | *Administrative Concerns for Paraprofessionals | Exhibit Arena I<br>Al Marten, Director<br>Beloit Special Education Office<br>Carol Nigus, Director<br>Brown County Kansas Special Education Cooperative<br>Hiawatha, Kansas |
| | *Body Management | Regency West I & II<br>Vera Yager,<br>Paraprofessional Coordinator<br>Tucson Public Schools |
| | *Transactional Analysis Skills for Paraprofessionals | Exhibit Arena II<br>Peter Packard and<br>Joyce Moody,<br>MSWs Private Practice,<br>Transactional Analysis Groups |
| | *Behavior Management | Exhibit Arena III<br>Renee Kiger,<br>PSA Consultant,<br>N.W. Kansas Educational Coop.<br>Colby, Kansas |
| 4:00 - 5:00 | *(These 4 workshops will be repeated during this time) | |
| 7:30 - 10:30 | SOCIAL | Parlor D & Room 353 |

# THE FIRST STATEWIDE CONFERENCE FOR PARAPROFESSIONALS

Saturday, March 31, 1979

## AGENDA

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 8:00 - 8:30 | Coffee | Meeting room for the entire day will be the EXHIBIT ARENA |
| 8:30 - 9:15 | "The Paraprofessional & CEC" | Rusty Welch,<br>Assistant Executive Director<br>Unit Development,<br>Council for Exceptional Children |
| 9:15 - 10:15 | "Is She For Real?" | Vera Yager,<br>Paraprofessional Coordinator,<br>Tucson Public Schools |
| 10:15 - 10:30 | BREAK | |
| 10:30 - 11:00 | Kansas Paraprofessional News | Phyllis Kelly &<br>Mary McKeever |
| 11:00 - 12:00 | Panel & Evaluation | Mary Beth Fafard<br>Anna Lou Pickett<br>Rusty Welch<br>Vera Yager<br>Al Marten<br>Carol Nigus<br>Renee Kiger |

# APPENDIX G

## LIST OF PARAPROFESSIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS

## AND

## AGENDA FROM THE FIRST PARAPROFESSIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

# PARAPROFESSIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Dr. Lowell Alexander
625 Minnesota (Library Bldg.)
Kansas City, KS 66101
Represents: Facilitators, LEAs, and Asst. Director of Spec. Ed.

Diana Schuster
R. R. 2
El Dorado, KS 67042
Represents: Paraprofessional and Facilitators

Dr. Earl Dungan
311 Park
Winfield, KS 67156
Represents: Facilitators and Institutional Settings

Ann Fritz
R. R. 1
Eskridge, KS 66432
Represents: Doctoral Student and Consultant

David Bilderback
Atchison-Jefferson Educ. Coop.
Box 488
604 Liberty
Oskaloosa, KS 66066
Represents: Fiscal Agent and Asst. Director of Spec. Ed.

Al Marten
Box 547
116 West Main
Beloit, KS 67420
Represents: Facilitators and Director of Special Education

Asel Harder
Garden City Community College
Box 977, 801 Campus Drive
Garden City, KS 67846
Represents: Community Colleges

Ted Wischropp
Division of Continuing Education
Umberger Hall
Manhattan, KS 66506
Represents: Continuing Education Dept. at KSU

Robert Floyd, Principal
614 North Merchant
Belle Plaine, KS 67013
Represents: Principals

Ed Gibbons
Capper Foundation
3500 W. 10th
Topeka, KS 66604
Represents: Institutional Settings

Dr. Gerry Hahn
5005 W. 95th
Shawnee Mission, KS 66207
Represents: Facilitators

Bert Hitchcock
802 Main
Russell, KS 67665
Represents: Assistant Superintendent and Facilitators

Dennis Hasson
Parsons State Hospital
3601 Gabriel
Parsons, KS 67357
Represents: Facilitators and Institutional Settings

Betty Janeski
2713 Belle
Topeka, KS 66614
Represents: Paraprofessionals

Dr. Bill Boomer
Coordinator/Special Education
Fort Hays State University
Hays, KS 67601
Represents: Colleges & Universities

Dr. Jack Lundy
Dean of Instruction
Allen County Community Junior College
1801 North Cottonwood
Iola, KS 66749
Represents: Community Colleges

Dr. Stan Wagstaff, Principal
Randolph Elementary School
1400 Randolph
Topeka, KS 66604
Represents: Principals

Dr. Robert Ramsay
Dean of Instruction
Kansas City Kansas Community Junior College
7250 State Avenue
Kansas City, KS 66112
Represents: Community Colleges

Mr. Walter Mathiasmeier
Director of Continuing Education
Cowley County Community Junior College
125 South 2nd
Arkansas City, KS 67005
Represents: Community Colleges

Dr. Larry Devane
Johnson County Community Junior College
College Blvd. at Quivira Road
Overland Park, KS 66210
Represents: Community Colleges

## EX OFFICIO MEMBERS:

Dr. Don Hardesty
Central Research
First National Bank Bldg.
Suite 900
Topeka, KS 66603
Represents: Media Materials Consultant

Dr. Larry Havlicek
Edu., Psy., & Research
Room 6, Barley Hall
University of Kansas
Lawrence, KS 66045
Represents: Evaluator

# PARAPROFESSIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

## AGENDA

Friday, February 23, 1979
1:00 - 3:00 p.m.

Drawing Room
Holiday Inn Plaza

I. Introductions

II. Purpose of Committee

III. Review of Grant Goals and Objectives

IV. Future Trends

# APPENDIX H

## OBSERVATION RATING SCALE

212

## DIRECTIONS FOR OBSERVERS:

Observe a paraprofessional for not less than 45 minutes under working conditions.

Please complete the rating scale for each of the skills listed. Under "No. of Times Observed", indicate the number of times the skill was observed during the observation period (use your best estimate). Then rate the paraprofessional for each skill by using the following ratings: (NOTES - 1. These ratings will be used for developing future training programs and will not be used for school district evaluation. 2. It is recommended that an observation period be not less than 45 minutes.)

1. Major improvement needed
2. Some improvement needed
3. Adequate
4. Very good
5. Excellent

## PARAPROFESSIONAL RATING SCALE

Name of Paraprofessional: ______________________

Class: ______________ Site: ______________

Supervising Teacher: ______________ Date: ______________

Facilitator: ______________ Time: ______________

### RATING SCALE

| | No. of Times Observed | Major improvement needed 1. | Some improvement needed 2. | Adequate 3. | Very good 4. | Excellent 5. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Working with children in carrying out activities of the child's program that have been initiated by the teacher. | | | | | | |
| a. one-to-one situations | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ |
| b. group activities | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ |
| c. problem solving | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ |
| 2. Interpersonal Relations (these are skills that will foster the team approach to working with special education children) | | | | | | |
| a. communicating with supervising teacher | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ |
| b. communicating with other school staff | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ |
| c. communicating with parents | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ |
| 3. Use of equipment and/or materials used with specific handicapping conditions (i.e. putting on and/or removing braces, signing. . .) | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ |

## RATING SCALE

| | No. of Times Observed | 1. Major improvement needed | 2. Some improvement needed | 3. Adequate | 4. Very good | 5. Excellent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 4. Use of techniques/methods of carrying out the educational programs in subject matter areas of: | | | | | | |
| a. academics | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ |
| b. speech/language | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ |
| c. self-help skills | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ |
| 5. Preparation skills | | | | | | |
| a. preparation of classroom materials | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ |
| b. preparation of classroom environment for learning activities | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ |
| 6. Assisting students with physical needs (toileting, feeding, dressing, . . .) | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ |
| 7. Skills in operation of office and audiovisual equipment | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ |
| 8. Managing and disciplining children | | | | | | |
| a. use of classroom management skills | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ |
| b. use of appropriate reinforcement techniques | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ |
| 9. Participation in professional activities | | | | | | |
| a. attendance at staff meetings | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ |
| b. attendance at staff inservice | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ |
| c. attendance at paraprofessional workshops | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ |

OVER

RATING SCALE

| | 1. Major improvement needed | 2. Some improvement needed | 3. Adequate | 4. Very good | 5. Excellent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 10. Has an understanding of the exceptional child as rated by performance and attitudes in the classroom. | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ |
| 11. Overall performance rating | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ |

# APPENDIX I

INTERVIEW FORMS

217

## PARAPROFESSIONAL FACILITATOR INTERVIEW

NAME: ______________________________ DATE: ______________

DISTRICT/COOPERATIVE: ______________________________

YEARS AS A FACILITATOR: ____________________

NUMBER OF PARAPROFESSIONALS IN DISTRICT/COOPERATIVE: ____________________

1. What are some training needs that are unique to your district/cooperative?

   . . . to specific special education programs within your district/cooperative?

   . . . to individual paraprofessionals?

2. Have you had requests from paraprofessionals for help or assistance in a specific area of training or for specific materials or aids?

   Yes _____ No _____

   If yes, what are they?

3. What additional information (not provided by available materials and/or State Department sponsored workshops?) do you, as facilitator, need in the training of paraprofessionals?

4. What paraprofessional training topics would you like to see presented at future facilitator workshops?

5. The following is a list of eight competencies for special education paraprofessionals. Please take a moment to rate these competencies in their order of importance in the training for paraprofessionals (1 = most important).

   _______ Understanding the characteristics of the special education student they will be working with

   _______ Skills related to working with children

   _______ Interpersonal relations (communication with teachers, parents, staff)

(Continued)

________ Disciplinary skills

________ Skills in working with specific handicapped children

________ Subject matter skills

________ Organizational skills

________ Skills in the operation of office and audiovisual equipment

6. Also, please take a few minutes and rate the following characteristics, skills and duties of instructional paraprofessionals.

Please rank these in their order of importance to a paraprofessional. (1 = most important)

a. creativity ________

b. resourcefulness ________

c. adaptability ________

d. tolerance ________

e. intelligence ________

f. versatility ________

g. experience with children ________

h. energy ________

i. dependability ________

j. good grooming ________

k. cooperation ________

Please rank the following skills in their order of importance in the training of a paraprofessional. (1 = most important)

a. skills related to working with children ________

b. subject matter skills ________

c. skills in understanding the characteristics of special education students ________

d. disciplinary skills ________

e. interpersonal relations skills ________

f. organizational skills ________

g. skills in operation of office and audio-visual equipment ________

h. skills in working with specific handicapped children ________

Other ________

The following duties can be performed by paraprofessionals. Please rank them first in their order of educational importance and then second in their order of occurrence. (1 = most important and occurs most often)

| Duty | Educational Importance | Commonness of Occurrence |
|---|---|---|
| a. preparation of classroom materials | ______ | ______ |
| b. assisting with group educational activities | ______ | ______ |
| c. working with audio-visual equipment | ______ | ______ |
| d. managing and disciplining children | ______ | ______ |
| e. clerical activities and office machines | ______ | ______ |
| f. maintaining classroom (housekeeping) | ______ | ______ |
| g. assisting students with physical needs | ______ | ______ |
| h. educating individual children (one-to-one basis) | ______ | ______ |
| i. conferring with teachers (planning) | ______ | ______ |
| j. participating in professional activities | ______ | ______ |
| k. preparation of classroom environment for learning activities | ______ | ______ |

7. The following is a checklist of administrative structures involved in the recruitment, selection, and employment of instructional paraprofessionals. Please check which ones you currently have in use. If you are in the process of developing any of them, write in the date of anticipated completion.

________ Training needs assessment

________ Affirmative action policy

________ Contract

________ Competencies for employment in specific special education programs

________ Job description

________ Paraprofessional Handbook

________ Salary Schedule

________ Career Ladder

________ Evaluation Procedure

PARAPROFESSIONAL INTERVIEW

NAME OF PARAPROFESSIONAL: ______________________________

DISTRICT/COOPERATIVE: ____________________ DATE: __________

SPECIAL EDUCATION PROGRAM(S) ASSIGNED TO: ____________________

____________________

SUPERVISING TEACHER(S) ASSIGNED TO: ____________________

____________________

TYPE OF PROGRAM ASSIGNED TO:

______ Self Contained

______ Resource Room

______ Itinerant

______ Other -- ______________

1. New paraprofessional? ____________

   Experienced paraprofessional? ________

   Number of years as a paraprofessional? __________

2. What level Paraprofessional Permit are you currently on?

   Permit I ________

   Permit II ________

   Permit III ________

3. How many hours of inservice training has your district/cooperative provided this school year?

4. From what other sources have you received training applicable to your role as an instructional paraprofessional?

   ______ State sponsored workshop

   ______ Community college

   ______ Area Vocational-Technical School

   ______ University

   ______ Other:

   ____________

   ____________

5. What are some specific areas you feel paraprofessionals need training in?

6. How many students do you have contact with each day in your role as an instructional paraprofessional?

7. Do you meet formally with your supervising teacher(s) for planning?

If yes, how often?

8. Are you involved in the Individual Educational Program (I.E.P.) Process for students in your special education program?

Yes ________ No ________

If yes, what are the areas of involvement?

________ informal diagnosis
________ planning program with teacher(s)
________ follow up instruction with students
________ evaluation

9. What types of activities are you responsible for in the special education program? What percent of your time do you spend in these activities?

| Activities | Percent of Time |
|---|---|
| ______ Instructional | ______ |
| ______ Supervisory | ______ |
| ______ Clerical | ______ |

10. What are three specific activities you do most often during the day?

1.
2.
3.

11. Are you familiar with the Kansas State Department of Education Paraprofessional Facilitator Training Model?

Yes ________ No ________

12. The following is a list of eight competencies for special education paraprofessionals. Please take a moment to rate these competencies in their order of importance in the training for paraprofessionals (1 = most important).

________ Understanding the characteristics of the special education student they will be working with
________ Skills related to working with children

(Continued)

________ Interpersonal relations (communication with teachers, parents, staff)

________ Disciplinary skills

________ Skills in working with specific handicapped children

________ Subject matter skills

________ Organizational skills

________ Skills in the operation of office and audiovisual equipment

13. Also, please take a few minutes and rate the following characteristics, skills and duties of instructional paraprofessionals.

Please rank these in their order of importance to a paraprofessional. (1 = most important)

a. creativity ________

b. resourcefulness ________

c. adaptability ________

d. tolerance ________

e. intelligence ________

f. versatility ________

g. experience with children ________

h. energy ________

i. dependability ________

j. good grooming ________

k. cooperation ________

Please rank the following skills in their order of importance in the training of a paraprofessional. (1 = most important)

a. skills related to working with children ________

b. subject matter skills ________

c. skills in understanding the characteristics of special education students ________

d. disciplinary skills ________

e. interpersonal relations skills ________

f. organizational skills ________

g. skills in operation of office and audio-visual equipment ________

h. skills in working with specific handicapped children ________

Other ________

The following duties can be performed by paraprofessionals. Please rank them first in their order of educational importance and then second in their order of occurrence. (1 = most important and occurs most often)

| Duty | Educational Importance | Commonness of Occurrence |
|---|---|---|
| a. preparation of classroom materials | ______ | ______ |
| b. assisting with group educational activities | ______ | ______ |
| c. working with audio-visual equipment | ______ | ______ |
| d. managing and disciplining children | ______ | ______ |
| e. clerical activities and office machines | ______ | ______ |
| f. maintaining classroom (housekeeping) | ______ | ______ |
| g. assisting students with physical needs | ______ | ______ |
| h. educating individual children (one-to-one basis) | ______ | ______ |
| i. conferring with teachers (planning) | ______ | ______ |
| j. participating in professional activities | ______ | ______ |
| k. preparation of classroom environment for learning activities | ______ | ______ |

# PARAPROFESSIONAL SUPERVISING TEACHER INTERVIEW

NAME: ______________________ DATE: __________

DISTRICT/COOPERATIVE: ______________________

SPECIAL EDUCATION PROGRAM: ______________________

TYPE OF PROGRAM:

_______ self-contained _______ itinerant

_______ resource room _______ other -- ______________

NAME OF PARAPROFESSIONALS SUPERVISING: ______________________

______________________

______________________

1. What do you perceive the role of the paraprofessional to be?

_______ instructional

_______ supervisory

_______ clerical

COMMENT:

2. Are you familiar with the Kansas State Department of Education Paraprofessional Facilitator Training Model?

Yes __________ No __________

3. What are some specific areas you feel paraprofessionals need training in?

4. Do you feel paraprofessionals would benefit from formalized college and inservice training?

Yes __________ No __________

COMMENT:

5. What activities is/are your paraprofessional(s) responsible for? What proportion of their time is spent in these activities?

| Activities | Time Spent |
|---|---|

6. Is/Are your paraprofessional(s) involved in the Individual Educational Program (I.E.P.) Process for any of your students?

Yes ____________ No ____________

If yes, what are the areas of involvement?

_______ informal diagnosis
_______ planning program with teacher(s)
_______ follow up instruction with students
_______ evaluation

7. Do you meet formally with your paraprofessional(s) for planning?

Yes ____________ No ____________

If yes, how often?

8. (a) Does your district/cooperative have a formalized evaluation procedure for paraprofessionals?

If yes to (a):

(b) Are you involved in that procedure?

Yes ____________ No ____________

(c) How often does the evaluation take place?

_______ weekly
_______ monthly
_______ biannually
_______ annually
_______ not at all

. What role do you feel you should have in the training of paraprofessionals who will be working in your special education program?

0. Have you ever had any formalized training in how to work with paraprofessionals and other support staff through college courses or inservice training?

If yes, explain.

1. What additional information do you need to work more effectively with paraprofessionals?

12. The following is a list of eight competencies for special education paraprofessionals. Please take a moment to rate these competencies in their order of importance in the training for paraprofessionals (1 = most important).

________ Understanding the characteristics of the special education student they will be working with

________ Skills related to working with children

________ Interpersonal relations (communication with teachers, parents, staff)

________ Disciplinary skills

________ Skills in working with specific handicapped children

________ Subject matter skills

________ Organizational skills

________ Skills in the operation of office and audiovisual equipment

13. Also, please take a few minutes and rate the following characteristics, skills and duties of instructional paraprofessionals.

Please rank these in their order of importance to a paraprofessional. (1 = most important)

a. creativity ________
b. resourcefulness ________
c. adaptability ________
d. tolerance ________
e. intelligence ________
f. versatility ________
g. experience with children ________
h. energy ________
i. dependability ________
j. good grooming ________
k. cooperation ________

Please rank the following skills in their order of importance in the training of a paraprofessional. (1 = most important)

a. skills related to working with children ________
b. subject matter skills ________
c. skills in understanding the characteristics of special education students ________
d. disciplinary skills ________
e. interpersonal relations skills ________
f. organizational skills ________
g. skills in operation of office and audio-visual equipment ________
h. skills in working with specific handicapped children ________
Other ________

The following duties can be performed by paraprofessionals. Please rank them first in their order of educational importance and then second in their order of occurrence. (1 = most important and occurs most often)

| Duty | Educational Importance | Commonness of Occurrence |
|---|---|---|
| a. preparation of classroom materials | ______ | ______ |
| b. assisting with group educational activities | ______ | ______ |
| c. working with audio-visual equipment | ______ | ______ |
| d. managing and disciplining children | ______ | ______ |
| e. clerical activities and office machines | ______ | ______ |
| f. maintaining classroom (housekeeping) | ______ | ______ |
| g. assisting students with physical needs | ______ | ______ |
| h. educating individual children (one-to-one basis) | ______ | ______ |
| i. conferring with teachers (planning) | ______ | ______ |
| j. participating in professional activities | ______ | ______ |
| k. preparation of classroom environment for learning activities | ______ | ______ |

# APPENDIX J

## RATING SCALES FOR MEDIA

TO BE FILLED OUT BY
TRAINER/FACILITATOR AFTER TRAINING

Return To: Phyllis Kelly
Special Education Administration
State Dept. of Education
120 East 10th Street
Topeka, KS 66612

-- PARAPROFESSIONAL TRAINING --

Name of Training Program: ______________________

Date: ______________________

Location: ______________________

Are you . . .

A facilitator 1. ___
A teacher 2. ___
An administrator 3. ___
A support person 4. ___
Other 5. ___

## EVALUATION OF TRAINING PROGRAM

### GENERAL ASSISTANCE & ACCEPTANCE

1. Was the program of significant assistance in orienting and training paraprofessionals?

If no, what was the problem? ______________________

______________________

______________________

Very much so 1. ___
Yes 2. ___
Somewhat 3. ___
No 4. ___
? 5. ___

2. How was the program received by paraprofessionals?

If mixed or negative, what were the problems the paras experienced? ______________________

______________________

______________________

Very well received 1. ___
Well received 2. ___
Mixed 3. ___
Not well received 4. ___
? 5. ___

3. If viewed by teachers, administrators, or support personnel; how was the program received?

If mixed or negative, what were the problems these people experienced? ______________________

______________________

______________________

Not viewed 1. ___
Very well received 2. ___
Well received 3. ___
Mixed 4. ___
Not well received 5. ___
? 6. ___

### SPECIFIC COMMENTS

4. Length of Program:

Much too long 1. ___
Too long 2. ___
About right 3. ___
Too brief 4. ___
Much too brief 5. ___
? 6. ___

5. Overall relevance:

Very relevant 1. ___
Relevant 2. ___
So-So 3. ___
Not relevant 4. ___
? 5. ___

(OVER PLEASE)

6. Accuracy of content:

Very accurate 1. ___
Accurate 2. ___
So-So 3. ___
Not accurate 4. ___
? 5. ___

7. Clarity of concepts:

Very clear 1. ___
Clear 2. ___
Mixed 3. ___
Unclear 4. ___
? 5. ___

8. Completeness:

Very complete 1. ___
Complete 2. ___
So-So 3. ___
Incomplete 4. ___
? 5. ___

9. Additional Comments: ______________________________________________

______________________________________________

______________________________________________

______________________________________________

(optional) Signed ______________________________

GENERAL FORM

-- AUDIO-VISUAL PROGRAM --

Name of Training Program: ______________________________

Date: ______________________________

Location: ______________________________

Are you . . .

A facilitator 1. ___
A teacher 2. ___
An administrator 3. ___
A support person 4. ___
Other 5. ___

## EVALUATION OF AUDIO-VISUAL PROGRAM

1. How informative did you personally find the program to be?

Very informative 1. ___
Informative 2. ___
So-So 3. ___
Not informative 4. ___

Comments: ______________________________
______________________________
______________________________

2. To what extent did the program provide you assistance in conveying the concepts to others?

Provided a good deal 1. ___
Provided some 2. ___
? 3. ___
Provided little 4. ___
Provided nothing 5. ___

Comments: ______________________________
______________________________
______________________________

3. How would you evaluate this program overall?

Very well done 1. ___
Well done 2. ___
So-So 3. ___
Not well done 4. ___
? 5. ___

Comments: ______________________________
______________________________
______________________________

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS

4. Length of program:

Much too long 1. ___
Too long 2. ___
About right 3. ___
Too brief 4. ___
Much too brief 5. ___
? 6. ___

5. Overall relevance:

Very relevant 1. ___
Relevant 2. ___
So-So 3. ___
Not relevant 4. ___
?

6. Accuracy of content:

Very accurate 1. ___
Accurate 2. ___
So-So 3. ___
Not accurate 4. ___
? 5. ___

7. Clarity of concepts:

Very clear 1. ___
Clear 2. ___
Mixed 3. ___
Unclear 4. ___
? 5. ___

8. Completeness:

Very completed 1. ___
Complete 2. ___
So-So 3. ___
Incomplete 4. ___
? 5. ___

(OVER PLEASE)

9. Additional comments: ________________________________________

________________________________________

________________________________________

________________________________________

(optional) Signed ______________________________

Return to: Phyllis Kelly
Special Education Administration
State Dept. of Education
120 East 10th Street
Topeka, KS 66612

PLEASE DUPLICATE AND DISTRIBUTE
TO TEACHERS AFTER TRAINING

AUDIO-VISUAL PROGRAM
-- TEACHER TRAINING ORIENTATION --

Return to: Phyllis Kelly
Special Education Administration
State Dept. of Education
120 East 10th Street
Topeka, KS 66612

Date: ______________________________

Location: __________________________

## EVALUATION OF TRAINING PROGRAM

### GENERAL ASSISTANCE & ACCEPTANCE

1. Was the program of significant assistance in orienting and training you to work with paraprofessionals?

If no, what was the problem? ________________

________________________________________

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Very much so | 1. | ___ |
| Yes | 2. | ___ |
| Somewhat | 3. | ___ |
| No | 4. | ___ |
| ? | 5. | ___ |

2. How would you evaluate this program overall?

If mixed or negative, what were the problems the paras experienced?

________________________________________

________________________________________

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Very well done | 1. | ___ |
| Well done | 2. | ___ |
| So-So | 3. | ___ |
| Not well done | 4. | ___ |
| ? | 5. | ___ |

### SPECIFIC COMMENTS

3. Length of program:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Much too long | 1. | ___ |
| Too long | 2. | ___ |
| About right | 3. | ___ |
| Too brief | 4. | ___ |
| Much too brief | 5. | ___ |
| ? | 6. | ___ |

4. Overall relevance:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Very relevant | 1. | ___ |
| Relevant | 2. | ___ |
| So-So | 3. | ___ |
| Not relevant | 4. | ___ |
| ? | 5. | ___ |

5. Accuracy of content:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Very accurate | 1. | ___ |
| Accurate | 2. | ___ |
| So-So | 3. | ___ |
| Not accurate | 4. | ___ |
| ? | 5. | ___ |

6. Clarity of concepts:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Very clear | 1. | ___ |
| Clear | 2. | ___ |
| Mixed | 3. | ___ |
| Unclear | 4. | ___ |
| ? | 5. | ___ |

7. Completeness:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Very complete | 1. | ___ |
| Complete | 2. | ___ |
| So-So | 3. | ___ |
| Incomplete | 4. | ___ |
| ? | 5. | ___ |

8. Additional comments: ________________________________________

________________________________________

________________________________________

(optional) Signed ______________________

DUPLICATE AND HAVE
PARAPROFESSIONAL COMPLETE.

-- PARAPROFESSIONAL TRAINING --

Name of Training Program: ______________________

Date: ______________________

Location: ______________________

## PARAPROFESSIONAL'S EVALUATION OF TRAINING PROGRAM

1. How interesting did you find the program to be?

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Very interesting | 1. | ___ |
| Interesting | 2. | ___ |
| So-So | 3. | ___ |
| Uninteresting | 4. | ___ |
| Dull | 5. | ___ |

2. To what extent did the program provide you with a better understanding and workable ideas?

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Provided a good deal | 1. | ___ |
| Provided some | 2. | ___ |
| ? | 3. | ___ |
| Provided little | 4. | ___ |
| Provided nothing | 5. | ___ |

3. How difficult was the material presented?

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Very difficult | 1. | ___ |
| Rather difficult | 2. | ___ |
| So-So | 3. | ___ |
| Rather easy | 4. | ___ |
| Very easy | 5. | ___ |

4. How many times do you feel that the program needs to be viewed in order to sufficiently master the concepts?

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Once | 1. | ___ |
| Two times | 2. | ___ |
| More | 3. | ___ |
| ? | 4. | ___ |

5. Would you recommend this program for use in the training/orientation of other paraprofessionals?

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Yes | 1. | ___ |
| ? | 2. | ___ |
| No | 3. | ___ |

6. How would you grade this program as a training/orientation for paraprofessionals?

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| A | 1. | ___ |
| B | 2. | ___ |
| C | 3. | ___ |
| D | 4. | ___ |
| F | 5. | ___ |
| ? | 6. | ___ |

TO BE COMPLETED BY FACILITATOR
OR TRAINER AFTER TRAINING

Return to: Phyllis Kelly
Special Education Administration
State Dept. of Education
120 East 10th Street
Topeka, KS 66612

AUDIO-VISUAL PROGRAM
-- TEACHER TRAINING/ORIENTATION --

Date: ______________________________

Are you . . .

- A facilitator 1. ___
- A teacher 2. ___
- An administrator 3. ___
- A support person 4. ___
- Other 5. ___

Location: ___________________________

## EVALUATION OF TRAINING PROGRAM

### GENERAL ASSISTANCE & ACCEPTANCE

1. Was the program of significant assistance in orienting and training teachers to work with paraprofessionals?

   If no, what was the problem? ________________________

   ____________________________________________________

   ____________________________________________________

   - Very much so 1. ___
   - Yes 2. ___
   - Somewhat 3. ___
   - No 4. ___
   - ? 5. ___

2. How was the program received by the teachers?

   If mixed or negative, what were the problems the paras experienced? ____________________

   ____________________________________________________

   ____________________________________________________

   - Very well received 1. ___
   - Well received 2. ___
   - Mixed 3. ___
   - Not well received 4. ___
   - ? 5. ___

3. If viewed by administrators or support personnel, how was the program received?

   If mixed or negative, what were the problems these people experienced? ____________________

   ____________________________________________________

   ____________________________________________________

   - Not viewed 1. ___
   - Very well received 2. ___
   - Well received 3. ___
   - Mixed 4. ___
   - Not well received 5. ___
   - ? 6. ___

### SPECIFIC COMMENTS

4. Length of program:

   - Much too long 1. ___
   - Too long 2. ___
   - About right 3. ___
   - Too brief 4. ___
   - Much too brief 5. ___
   - ? 6. ___

5. Overall relevance:

   - Very relevant 1. ___
   - Relevant 2. ___
   - So-So 3. ___
   - Not relevant 4. ___
   - ? 5. ___

(OVER PLEASE)

6. Accuracy of content:

Very accurate 1. ___
Accurate 2. ___
So-So 3. ___
Not accurate 4. ___
? 5. ___

7. Clarity of concepts:

Very clear 1. ___
Clear 2. ___
Mixed 3. ___
Unclear 4. ___
? 5. ___

8. Completeness:

Very complete 1. ___
Complete 2. ___
So-So 3. ___
Incomplete 4. ___
? 5. ___

9. Additional comments: ____________________________________________
____________________________________________
____________________________________________
____________________________________________

(optional) Signed ______________________________

# APPENDIX K

## SUMMATION OF PILOT TEST OF MEDIA RATING SCALES

239

## SUMMATION OF PILOT TEST OF

## MEDIA RATING SCALES

### ROLES & RESPONSIBILITIES

Name of training program

SPED 588 Workshop - Training and Utilizing the Special Education Teacher Aide Graduate Level

Date shown

July 5 to July 20, 1979

Location

Millersville State College

Are you. . .

A facilitator ______
A teacher ______
An administrator ______
A support person ______
Other __X__ -- college professor

### EVALUATION OF AUDIO-VISUAL PROGRAM

1. How informative did you personally find the program to be.

Very informative X
Informative
So-so
Not informative

Comments: Covered the essentials clearly and comprehensively.

2. To what extent did the program provide you assistance in conveying the concepts to others?

Provided a good deal X
Provided some
Provided little
Provided nothing

Comments: Helped clarify to the students the degree of para-task involvement in instruction.

3. How would you evaluate this program overall?

Very well done X
Well done
So-so
Not well done
?

Comments: Excellent - Useful in PA because of similarity of guidelines except for aide monitoring class in teachers absence -- could lead to liability suit!

SPECIFIC COMMENTS

4. Length of program:
Much too long
Too long
About right X
Too brief
Much too brief

5. Overall relevance:
Very relevant X
Relevant
So-so
Not relevant

6. Accuracy of content:
Very Accurate X
Accurate
So-so
Not accurate

7. Clarity of concepts:
Very clear X
Clear
Mixed
Unclear

8. Completeness:
Very complete X
Complete
So-so
Incomplete

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:

An appreciation is extended to you for sharing this excellent material.

P.L. 94-142

Name of Training Program

Presentation for college course Issues in Education 15

Date Shown

June 21, 1979

Are you. . .

A facilitator ______
A teacher 14
An administrator ______
A support person ______
Other X -- college professor

Location

Washburn University 15

## EVALUATION OF AUDIO-VISUAL PROGRAM

1. How informative did you personally find the program to be?

| | |
|---|---|
| Very informative | 6 |
| Informative | 9 |
| So-so | |
| Not informative | |

Comments: Well done - quite complete and objective
Easy to follow, clear-cut
Very good
Much I had heard before

2. To what extent did the program provide you assistance in conveying the concepts to others?

| | |
|---|---|
| Provided a good deal | 4 |
| Provided some | 7 |
| ? | 2 |
| Provided little | |
| Provided nothing | |
| No answer | 2 |

Comments: Well done with the assistance of a moderator
I have had no need to convey the information
Not applicable

3. How would you evaluate this program overall?

| | |
|---|---|
| Very well done | 6 |
| Well done | 9 |
| So-so | |
| Not well done | |
| ? | |

Comments: Quite informative and objective
Went a little too fast
Some jargon
Very good

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 4. Length of program: | Much too long | | |
| | Too long | 3 | |
| | About right | 12 | |
| | Too brief | | |
| | Much too brief | | |
| 5. Overall relevance: | Very relevant | 4 | |
| | Relevant | 11 | |
| | So-so | | |
| | Not relevant | | |
| 6. Accuracy of content: | Very accurate | 8 | |
| | Accurate | 6 | |
| (Written comments: | So-so | | |
| good, seemed accurate) | Not accurate | | Didn't know 2 |
| 7. Clarity of concepts: | Very clear | 7 | |
| | Clear | 8 | |
| | Mixed | | |
| | Unclear | | |
| 8. Completeness: | Very complete | 6 | |
| | Complete | 9 | |
| | So-so | | |
| | Incomplete | | |

## ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:

Quality of slides, selection of subjects, sound and overall organization were great. I'm proud of you Kelly. I hope this is being used to its maximum and sent out over the state.

This slide program P.L. 94-142 I feel really enhanced my presentation on the paraprofessional in Special Education. I really appreciate being able to use it and also the use of the visual aide equipment that was loaned to me from your department. Thank you!

Pat Brown did a good job of presenting this program.

# APPENDIX L

## STAFF DEVELOPMENT/INSERVICE EFFORTS

# STAFF DEVELOPMENT/INSERVICE EFFORTS - JULY 1, 1978 - JUNE 30, 1979

## Workshops — Total for Workshops: 4,215

- General Education Teachers: 122
- General Education Administrators: 299
- Special Education Administrators: 678
- Special Education Personnel: 1456
- Paraprofessionals: 1098
- Other: 81
  - University Personnel: 121
  - Project Directors: 5
  - Parents: 5
  - Deans, DSE at CC, Private Colleges, AVTS: 49
  - Therapists: 23
  - Counselors: 21
  - Preschool: 43
  - Students: 45
  - Clinicians: 5
  - Mental Health, Physicians, SRS, Public Health, Nurses: 91
  - Vocational Education Personnel: 38
  - Vocational Habilitation: 35

## Ongoing — Total for Ongoing Staff Efforts: 45

- Special Education Administration: 3
- Special Education Personnel: 15
- Administration of Preschools, Public Health, SRS: 27

## Consultation — Total Consultations: 346

- General Education Teachers: 32
- General Education Administration: 9
- Special Education Administration: 55
- Special Education Personnel: 48
- Paraprofessionals: 25
- All Areas: 150
- Other:
  - Education Directors: 9
  - Board of Trustees Lay Members: 10
  - University Personnel: 3
  - SEA Personnel: 2
  - CC Deans: 2
  - Parents: 1

## Other — Total for "Other" Staff Development Efforts: 137

- General Education Teachers: 29
- General Education Administration: 2
- Special Education Administration: 20
- Special Education Personnel: 28
- Paraprofessionals: 30
- Other:
  - Trainers: 3
  - Vocational Education: 25